Daily Report

East Europe

FBIS-EEU-91-076
Friday
19 April 1991

Daily Report
East Europe

FBIS-EEU-91-076 *19 April 1991*

CONTENTS

NOTICE TO READERS: * indicates material not disseminated in electronic form.

BULGARIA

Dimitrov, Tomov Discuss Reform, Confrontation *[DUMA 15 Apr]* 1
BSP, SDS Leaders Debate Current Issues *[BTA]* 1
Lilov: Opposition Right Wing Seeks Destabilization *[BTA]* 2
Radical Party Forms 'Alternative' Assembly *[DUMA 15 Apr]* 2
Kostov Views Progress of Economic Reform *[BTA]* 3
Shindarov 'Instructed' by Soviets on Chernobyl *[BTA]* 3
Police Demonstrate, Call Attention to Problems *[BTA]* 3
Danov Says 33 Informants Remain in Assembly *[BTA]* 3
Ruse Technical Students Abandon Sit-In *[Sofia Radio]* 4
New Independent Daily "24 CHASA" Appears *[BTA]* 4

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Foreign Minister Dienstbier on Future of Country
[Frankfurt/Main FRANKFURTER RUNDSCHAU 11 Apr] 5
'Ruthenian Revival' Movement Issue Statement *[NARODNA OBRODA 11 Apr]* 6
Carnugovsky Concerned About Slovak Government *[Prague Radio]* 6
Alliance Between Meciar Faction, Democrats Viewed *[Cibula in NARODNA OBRODA 15 Apr]* 6
Carnogursky Views Possibility of 'State Treaty' *[LIDOVA DEMOKRACIE 9 Apr]* 7
Minister Knazko on Slovak International Relations *[Bratislava PRAVDA 13 Apr]* 8
Slovak Parties View Constitutional Procedure *[NARODNA OBRODA 11 Apr]* 8
SNR Chairman on Need for 'Extensive Solution' *[NARODNA OBRODA 12 Apr]* 9
Slovak Polls See Paradoxes in Political Attitudes *[Slavik in MLADA FRONTA DNES 12 Apr]* 9
Defense Minister Views Nuclear Ammunition Storage *[CTK]* 10

HUNGARY

Goncz, Bulgaria's Zhelev Sign Political Statement *[MTI]* 11
Foreign Affairs Chairman Views Moscow Visit *[NEPSZABADSAG 13 Apr]* 11
Assembly Committee Told of Soviet Withdrawal *[MTI]* 12
Slovakia's Miklosko on Improving Relations *[MAGYAR NEMZET 16 Apr]* 12
Finance Minister Interviewed on London Talks *[MTI]* 12
Finance Minister on Future Economic Prospects *[168 ORA 16 Apr]* 13
Personal ID Numbers Ruled 'Anticonstitutional' *[MTI]* 14

POLAND

Prime Minister Bielecki Views Soviet Ties *[DZIENNIK BALTYCKI 8 Apr]* 15
Prime Minister, Unions Discuss Privatization *[PAP]* 15
Presidential Aide on Domestic Political Scene *[GLOS PORANNY 6-7 Apr]* 16
Council of Ministers Views Budget Crisis, Taxes *[PAP]* 17
Stock Exchange Reopens After Half Century *[PAP]* 18

ROMANIA

French President Mitterrand Pays Official Visit 19
Begins Official Talks With Iliescu *[Bucharest Radio]* 19
Bilateral Relations Discussed *[Bucharest Radio]* 19
Confers With Prime Minister Roman *[ROMPRES]* 19
Meets With Intellectuals *[Bucharest Radio]* 19

Palace Dinner Held; Iliescu Proposes Toast *[ROMPRES]* 20
Mitterrand Also Proposes Toast *[ROMPRES]* 20
Confers Honors on Iliescu, Roman *[ROMPRES]* 21
Meets Opposition Leaders *[ROMPRES]* 21
Delivers Speech to Parliament *[Bucharest Radio]* 21
Elysee Palace Spokesman Cited on Visit *[ROMPRES]* 24

YUGOSLAVIA

Presidents Issue Statement on Republics' Future *[TANJUG]* 25
Republican Presidents Meet Press *[TANJUG]* 25
Slovene Assembly Meets on Military Service Issue *[Belgrade Radio]* 29
Spegelj's Attorney Doubts Court's 'Objectiveness' *[TANJUG]* 29
Trial Awaits Court Order Implementation *[TANJUG]* 30
Draskovic Scheduled To Stand Trial in Belgrade *[TANJUG]* 30

Dimitrov, Tomov Discuss Reform, Confrontation

AU1804163491 Sofia DUMA in Bulgarian 15 Apr 91 p 1

[Text] Yesterday's television debate between Aleksandur Tomov, deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers, and Filip Dimitrov, leader of the Union of Democratic Forces [SDS], ended with a peaceful and unanimous conclusion—namely, that if privatization, which is part of the structural stage of the reform, should be delayed, the unemployed in this country would be both supporters of the Bulgarian Socialist Party [BSP] and of the SDS.

The debate was prompted by Filip Dimitrov's statement at a recent SDS rally in Sofia, declaring that people in Bulgaria are facing mass unemployment. According to Dimitrov, this was a result of the Bulgarian Communist Party [BCP] administration—namely that the Zhivkov rule shares 30 percent of the responsibility, while 60 percent of the responsibility should be attributed to the Lukanov government. I raised the question of whether the remaining 10 percent of the responsibility for unemployment should not be attributed to Mr. Tomov, the SDS leader pointed out.

Dimitrov added that he was very surprised by the reaction that this matter-of-fact remark evoked. It was interpreted almost as an attack against the government and prompted the prime minister to make a statement on the question, he said. As is known, the prime minister disagreed with the reprimands against the BSP-affiliated ministers.

Aleksandur Tomov pointed out that politicians differ from ordinary citizens by the fact that they always detect some meaning behind a statement. I think that your statement at the rally was intended as a warning to the public that, should there be any unemployment in the country people should know who is responsible for it. There is also another context related to recent events—namely, the implication that a certain group, the group of the Socialists, is trying to obstruct the reform wherever there is an opportunity to do so, in the legislature and in the government. This is what I categorically object to, Tomov said.

He declared that if Dimitrov was really interested in what is going on within the government, he would learn that the Socialist ministers are not only active supporters, but even exponents of the reform to a great extent. Discussions are certainly taking place, but the difference between the cabinet members are based on their professional views, rather than on their party affiliations.

Dimitrov pointed out that Decree No. 57 of the Council of Ministers related to the establishment of structures within the municipal people's councils and to the appointment of department chiefs and civil servants in the councils as a negative example of BSP ministers's efforts to delay the reform.

Tomov explained that it is a question of appointing professionals rather than political figures in the aforementioned case. You are well aware that the united opposition has privileges in all places, or nearly in all places, and if there is no competition based on specific criteria for the appointment of civil servants in local administrations they might easily be elected for other reasons, Tomov stated.

Dimitrov frequently mentioned the economic nomenklatura and its reasons for arresting the progress of the reform.

The vice prime minister replied as follows: I am disturbed by the recent evaluations of the obstacles to the reform. I realize that certain economic managers are still incapable of coping with the reform; however, I have great misgivings in hearing you talk about the entire economic nomenklatura. I object to all assessments that are not based on economic arguments on this subject.

According to Tomov, the second, structural stage of the reform would be accelerated if the legislature should adopt the remaining four or five economic laws.

Dimitrov expressed his doubts whether the privatization law will be easily adopted considering that it involves existing owners.

Tomov objected that there are no ideological obstacles to passing the privatization bill, which is an important part of the second stage of the reform.

Confrontation is the only obstacle to reform, the vice prime minister stated. The refusal to recognize a party's right of existence, the permanent attempts of exacerbating the situation by unfounded accusations—these are the greatest obstacles to progress, Tomov added.

BSP, SDS Leaders Debate Current Issues

AU1804081191 Sofia BTA in English 2117 GMT 17 Apr 91

[Text] Sofia, April 17 (BTA)—The two leaders of the Socialist Party [BSP] and of the Union of Democratic Forces [SDS] exchanged a few "blows" tonight and the host of the TV programme promised to give them an opportunity for new bouts. The leader of the Socialists, Mr. Aleksandur Lilov, believes that the demands of the opposition for the dissolution of parliament and for holding prompt parliamentary elections are dangerous. According to him this would lead to a cabinet crisis and would slow down the reform.

Mr. Filip Dimitrov, chairman of the Coordinating Council of the UDF [Union of Democratic Forces], does not deem these demands fearful and a threat to social peace. According to him the BSP is simply afraid of the elections.

Both leaders are against the use of strong epithets in qualifying political opponents, but still Mr. Filip Dimitrov added that he understands the sympathisers of the

opposition when they speak of "Red rubbish," etc. His thesis is that they have in mind those representatives of the top party crust who went on a special diet after the Chernobyl accident, those who "exported Bulgaria" and plundered her in the years of totalitarianism.

According to Mr. Filip Dimitrov there is no extreme right in the opposition but parties to the right of the centre. Mr. Aleksandur Lilov is of a different opinion and is convinced that the extreme right within and outside the UDF is pursuing a very dangerous policy.

Both sides repeated their opinions on the issue of who is slowing down the reform and Mr. Lilov proposed that the two political forces begin to judge each other by their deeds.

The Socialist leader refuted the rumours that he is about to resign. This is a question within the competence of the congress of the party, he pointed out.

Lilov: Opposition Right Wing Seeks Destabilization

AU1804075191 Sofia BTA in English 2027 GMT 17 Apr 91

[Text] Sofia, April 17 (BTA)—One of the speakers at a rally of the Bulgarian Socialist Party [BSP] held here today declared himself for the holding of direct presidential elections. The participants in the rally supported him, shouting "Lukanov president."

Former Prime Minister Andrey Lukanov, now deputy chairman of the Supreme Council of the BSP, thanked them. He attacked the opposition, and particularly its right wing, accusing it of trying to destabilize the political situation in this country by demanding the dissolution of the Grand National Assembly and general elections before the constitution and the basic laws of the reform have been adopted.

The leader of the Socialists, Mr. Aleksandur Lilov, added that "the extreme right in the Union of Democratic Forces and not the BSP is the main threat to democratization in Bulgaria." According to Mr. Lilov, the opposition is about to repeat its mistake of the previous elections by staking on "a total negation of all that has been achieved in Bulgaria in the past years" in its election campaign. He confirmed the stand of the BSP for holding the general elections after the present parliament adopts the Constitution and the basic laws and after the local elections. The BSP continues to support the government and the reform it has undertaken, which the leader of the Socialists described as the only way out of the crisis.

The Socialist Party has half a million members and it is the largest Bulgarian party, Mr. Lilov said. He said that 20 per cent of the Socialists are under 40, 40 per cent are in their active age and the remaining are pensioners.

Mr. Lilov appealed for national unity and expressed his conviction in the victory of the BSP in the elections.

Radical Party Forms 'Alternative' Assembly

AU1804164191 Sofia DUMA in Bulgarian 15 Apr 91 p 1

[Stefan Severin report from Oborishte: "A Historical Stage Performance With Topical Objectives"]

[Excerpts] Over 300 members of the National Radical Party from all over the country elected 200 deputies for an "alternative" Grand National Assembly and a prime minister for their "shadow" cabinet.

Dr. Ivan Georgiev, chairman of the Bulgarian National Radical Party was elected "chairman of the legislature." Father Ivan Krustev was unanimously nominated as prime minister.

Dr. Ivan Georgiev delivered a long address in which he stated among other things: "For over a year, our protests addressed to the Grand National Assembly have not been taken seriously. We want to save our beloved motherland from incipient national nihilism. He further pointed out that "Zhelyu Zhelev is a traitor and inspirer of the idea about introducing Turkish language in schools." The public responded by chanting: "Never" and "resignation." The speaker called the president of the republic a "servile American lackey" who intends to destroy our country by integrating it in the Black Sea economic zone. The warned that if the voice of his party should not be heard, he intends to organize a second April uprising to which the freezing and wet National Radicals, who were standing in the rain, responded shouting: "We are ready!"

Following this, Natasha Voykina, Professor Aleksandur Atanasov, and Father Georgi Golemanov were elected deputy chairmen of the alternative Grand National Assembly. [passage omitted]

The delegates who claimed to be representatives of 134 committees and nearly 38,000 members of the Bulgarian National Radical Party came to Oborishte on Saturday, 13 April, and camped in the open air. [passage omitted]

Exceptional security measures were adopted by the militia forces on the occasion prompted by rumors about possible attacks, and clashes.

No clashes occurred. The so-called "alternative national assembly" held its meeting at a few hundred meters from the historical site of Oborishte [where the 1876 uprising against the Turkish domination took place].

At the most dramatic moment of the meeting an officer of the Traffic Control Department appeared among the public and carefully filmed the event with a camera. This is how the militia forces recorded the "truly historic event" as it was called by its organizers.

Kostov Views Progress of Economic Reform

AU1804135891 Sofia BTA in English 1313 GMT 18 Apr 91

[Text] Sofia, April 18 (BTA)—"The economic reform in Bulgaria has not bogged down, it has come to a natural stop in its progress," Mr. Ivan Kostov, minister of finance, says. "TRUD" and "OTECHESTVEN VESTNIK" quote the most popular minister in Prime Minister Dimitur Popov's cabinet as saying that the changes are irreversible and that the first positive results of the measures that were taken could be expected by the middle of 1992.

According to the finance minister, the benefits of the reform are not yet evident, but the important thing is that the nation realizes it must be carried out. It may be taken undue advantage of during the election campaign, but whatever government comes to power after the elections it will carry on the reform by all means, he added.

What matters in Mr. Kostov's opinion is that "we have survived, there have been no riots and the state did not disintegrate."

Minister Kostov points out that things might have gone much better if more radical, hence more painful but effective measures were set in train. According to him, the pace of the reform is too slow, but there is no alternative to it.

The minister says that the reform will enter upon a new phase as painful as the first stage.

There are many problems. Enterprises are trying to evade taxation. There are considerable difficulties in paying pensions and social benefits. Bulgaria's unfavourable trade balances with the Soviet Union and the other East European countries also give rise to a lot of problems.

Commenting on the unemployment in the country, Minister Kostov says it should not exceed eight to ten per cent.

Shindarov 'Instructed' by Soviets on Chernobyl

AU1904091091 Sofia BTA in English 2118 GMT 18 Apr 91

[Text] Sofia, April 18 (BTA)—Prof. Lyubomir Shindarov, former sanitary inspector general, casually told the court today that information on the radiation situation used to be classified. Prof. Shindarov is defendant in Case no.2, known as the Chernobyl Case. After the Chernobyl accident he visited the Soviet Embassy in Sofia "to be instructed on how to act under the circumstances." He had been told that "it was nothing serious, and that the embassy would keep in touch with the Bulgarian Government."

Prof. Shindarov said that the Standing Governmental Commission on Management of Natural Disasters and Major Industrial Accidents, headed by Grigor Stoichkov, the other defendant in the trial, had usurped many functions of Shindarov's inspectorate. Grigor Stoichkov pleaded not guilty of the aftereffects of the Chernobyl accident on the Bulgarian people. On his part, Prof. Shindarov said that the sanitary inspector general was almost a figurehead office.

One of the questions he did not answer was why he had waited for information on the situation in this country after the accident instead of asking for it himself.

The court will question witnesses on the case on Monday.

Police Demonstrate, Call Attention to Problems

AU1904091491 Sofia BTA in English 2145 GMT 18 Apr 91

[Text] Sofia, April 18 (BTA)—The Federation of Independent Trade Unions of Policemen will launch nationwide protest actions on May 1 unless parliament starts debating an Interior Ministry bill and the pressing problems of the police. This was announced today after Sofia witnessed an impressive police demonstration. It was occasioned by the recent murder of a police officer. In a declaration addressed to the authorities the federation lists problems facing the police, such as the growing aggressiveness of criminals in Bulgaria, frequent assaults and even killings of policemen, and other problems.

The declaration insists that the moratorium on the death penalty be lifted.

It was announced at a news conference that the crime rate recorded an all-time high this year.

Danov Says 33 Informants Remain in Assembly

AU1804095491 Sofia BTA in English 0922 GMT 18 Apr 91

[Text] Sofia, April 18 (BTA)—At the moment in the Bulgarian Parliament there are 33 police informants and payroll collaborators of Department 6 of the former State Security services, the deputy chairman of the Commission of Inquiry says. "ZEMYA" quotes Mr. Rumen Danov as saying that those who are still cooperating with the security services will be deprived of their immunity.

The commission itself was not immaculate and three of its members had to be removed from it. "Had some of the MP's not been so assiduous in their cooperation with the political police, it would have been possible to seek a more delicate way to wind up the case," Mr. Danov pointed out.

Here are some of the suggestions the commission has made: First, an inquiry should be held into the disappearance of the archives of Section 6 of Department 6 (the most secret unit, whose officers spied on top party

officials and active fighters against fascism and capitalism, forwarding information directly to former head of state Todor Zhivkov); second, all the MP's on the list of informants who practically did not do any harm to people should be freed from blame; third, the elections act should bear a clause according to which information should be provided in advance of all election candidates who cooperated with the secret services.

Under the headline "Commission of Inquiry Report Improperly Publicized," the daily of the opposition Union of Democratic Forces "DEMOKRATSIYA" claims that the report of the Commission of Inquiry has already been submitted to the Bureau of the Grand National Assembly which has made copies of it, distributing them among the chairmen of the parliamentary groups.

According to the daily, not all members of the commission have signed the report drafted by its leadership (according to the regulations only its leadership can process the secret information it receives). The daily claims that not all incriminated collaborators have seen their police files and puts the question whether this is the full list of collaborators, having in mind that in the last two weeks alone four new names have been added to it.

"DEMOKRATSIYA" expects that there will be political machinations around the police files, noting that it would not be surprised if the report appears for sale in the black market. The daily puts the question to whose avail all this is and then links the problem with the parliamentary debates on the new constitution. Obviously once again both the form and the timing for a provocation have been carefully chosen—it coincides with the first plenary steps to the adoption of the new constitution, the daily writes.

"There can be no doubt that the list of informers is incomplete and unreliable," Mr. Vladislav Daskalov, member of the Commission of Inquiry, is quoted as saying in "DEMOKRATSIYA."

Ruse Technical Students Abandon Sit-In

AU1904095491 Sofia Domestic Service in Bulgarian 0900 GMT 19 Apr 91

[Text] This morning the students suspended their sit-in at the Ruse Technical University. Following extended talks between the student strike committee, the Ministry of Science and Higher Education, Ruse Municipal Council, and the Academic Council, the students changed the form of their protest from a sit-in to strike readiness. They consider that almost all of their demands have been satisfied, or at least sufficient guarantees have been given that they will be fulfilled.

In the early hours of this morning, an agreement was signed between the strike committee and the Academic Council, and normal classes have been resumed.

New Independent Daily "24 CHASA" Appears

AU1804140491 Sofia BTA in English 1308 GMT 18 Apr 91

[Text] Sofia, April 18 (BTA)—As of today Bulgarians can buy the new "24 CHASA" ("24 Hours") daily, advertised as a daily providing maximum news in minimum words.

It is the new "offspring" of the "168 CHASA" press group which has been publishing a weekly of the same name since April last year.

Its publishers claim that "24 CHASA" is the first independent daily in this country after "the victory of the socialist revolution" and after the changes of November 10, 1989.

For the time being it is to come out in four pages, but the plans are to increase its volume to 16-20 pages.

In its first issue the daily criticises a Social Democrat who appealed in parliament for freeing the party clique publications from the turnover tax. His actions are described as an attempt to "stifle" the independent press.

Reporting of the experimental broadcasts of the Voice of America for Bulgaria, the daily recalls that Bulgarians are not admitted to the air.

It does not spare the Bureau of the parliament either, which, according to the daily, includes two police informers.

Ex-Deputy Minister of Foreign Trade Georgi Vutev, serving a sentence for malpractices, asserts that the deceased daughter of the former No.1 Todor Zhivkov—Lyudmila, spent seven million U.S. dollars on travels abroad.

For the time being "24 CHASA" is the cheapest newspaper in this country—it costs only 48 stotinki.

Foreign Minister Dienstbier on Future of Country

AU1704113291 Frankfurt/Main FRANKFURTER RUNDSCHAU in German 11 Apr 91 p 7

[Interview with Foreign Minister Jiri Dienstbier by Ullrich Glauber in Prague; date not given: "The Revolution Was Easier Than Changing the Laws Now"]

[Text] [Glauber] It is said that Hungary is striving for a free trade zone in Eastern-Central Europe. This free trade zone is to be established by bilateral agreements with Poland and the CSFR. Do you agree with this goal?

[Dienstbier] You had better ask the economic ministers and not me. I only see the necessity to establish the bases for such an undertaking. Because of the different situation in the CSFR and in Hungary it will take some time anyway, before such an agreement can be concluded.

[Glauber] On principle, however, the CSFR accepts the premise that there is a demand for a Central European free trade zone?

[Dienstbier] I am not sure of that. I think we have to try to establish the preconditions for free trade with the EC—and that goes for all of the three mentioned countries. Furthermore, we cannot tackle things that make it more difficult to achieve this goal. On the other hand, cooperation is useful wherever it is possible.

[Glauber] Would it not be better to form a strong pressure group of the Eastern-Central European countries and a coalition of the three countries to exert pressure for acceptance in the EC?

[Dienstbier] We cannot exert pressure. First, we have to establish the internal preconditions for membership. It was easier to stage a revolution than it is now to change 800 different laws. First, we are trying to adjust our legal system to that of the EC, and we have to take 100 different steps before we can become a member. If we can cooperate with Poland and Hungary in this respect, this would naturally have advantages.

[Glauber] President Havel and you yourself have repeatedly said that NATO is probably the one organization that can really bring the CSCE process to a conclusion, even with the prospect of a Japanese-European security partnership. Is the CSCE able to implement what you expected it to do a year ago?

[Dienstbier] The CSCE is the only platform—not yet an institution, but we believe in the gradual institutionalization of the CSCE—the only forum, that links Europe and the United States, the entire European area and North America. I think that the issue is a step-by-step approach.

NATO is one of the pillars of the process, because at the moment it is the only functioning security partnership in the world. There is the possibility of cooperation with the Western European defense community, the WEU [Western European Union], and we could imagine concluding a number of bilateral agreements for security reasons. All this should result in a network of cooperation, which becomes increasingly hard, before a stable ring of security is established.

It was possible to turn France and Germany into friends after centuries of bitter warfare. At the same time, the countries in Eastern Europe were separated, which created a hotbed of conflict. The more intensive each one of these countries is integrated into the various international institutions, the sooner it will be possible to solve the problems of the region. Also, we must not forget that the East-West conflict may turn into a North-South conflict. We have just seen what happens when the politicians of the South want confrontation. We also must assume that if the Soviet Union crumbles, a large part of it will belong to the South, possibly with all the nuclear potential that exists in the Soviet Union—knock on wood. I do not want to sound any alarms, however.

[Glauber] U.S. Secretary of Defense Richard Cheney said a few days ago that Gorbachev's days are numbered. What kind of threat do you see in the Soviet Union—or in its individual parts?

[Dienstbier] We do not feel any threat to our future by a Soviet intervention. This is the time of the dissolution of the Soviet empire. We can speak of some kind of collapse of the Soviet economy; therefore, internal problems will have to be solved first. As a result, at the moment the threat lies above all in the economic area, because if the Soviet economy crumbles further it will be very difficult for our enterprises to find markets, from which they can purchase oil and gas. Furthermore,—even though this is only a theoretical issue at the moment—if a collapse should really occur, we do not know how many people will leave the country and under which circumstances; whether it will be a mass exodus or whether only political emigres will come. It would be nonsense to spread panic, but we must keep an eye on that.

[Glauber] Do you think that Slovakia is leaning more and more toward the Soviet Union and that tensions in the CSFR will increase as a result?

[Dienstbier] I do not think that Slovakia is turning toward the USSR. I only think that it has much greater difficulties with the current situation than Bohemia and Moravia. In Bohemia the workers have different possibilities to find jobs. In some Slovak towns, however, there is one big factory and everyone in the region depends on this source of income. Then there is a lot of military industry there—for two reasons: First, a new branch of production was supposed to be established in Slovakia because the country was little industrialized in the past. Second, this was based on strategic considerations: The arms industry should be as far away from the western border as possible.

[Glauber] Some Slovak politicians advocate the view that Slovakia might turn toward the Soviet Union, if Prague does not make any further concession.

[Dienstbier] I do not know to whom you are referring. How can they turn toward the Soviet Union? The Soviet Union does not have any money; the economy is in a disastrous condition. We know that a lot of Soviet enterprises and republics urgently need our goods, but even for foodstuffs and textiles they have terms of payment of two years. How can we agree to that? We have to pay our workers.

[Glauber] Relations between reunited Germany and the CSFR are as unstrained as they have not been for decades. By summer a "treaty on good neighborliness and friendly cooperation" is to be concluded. Are there any problems because of the demands made by the Germans who were expelled from the Sudeten region?

[Dienstbier] Relations between the CSFR and the FRG are excellent. I think that both sides want to draw a thick line under the past. I know that the FRG Government is under some pressure, but we, for our part, are also under such pressure. It would be nonsense to make things more complicated by discussing what happened in 1939 and 1945. The CSFR has accepted its responsibility. President Havel and I have repeatedly said concerning the expulsion of the Sudeten Germans: This was not justice but revenge, but the Sudeten Germans also have to accept what they did to the Czechs before 1945.

'Ruthenian Revival' Movement Issue Statement

AU1604112891 Bratislava NARODNA OBRODA in Slovak 11 Apr 91 p 3

[Statement by "Ruthenian Revival" Movement Chairman Vasil Turok: "Mr. Duray, We Insist"]

[Text] Mr. Duray [chairman of the "Coexistence" political movement associating ethnic minorities living in Czechoslovakia], we insist that, when giving various briefings at home and abroad, you do not speak on behalf of all ethnic minorities. As we learned in NARODNA OBRODA yesterday, during a news conference in Vienna you demanded the return of farmland to people who subverted our republic and aided fascism. Where did you have the audacity to present these views as the unified view of ethnic minorities; Ruthenians living in the CSFR hold the completely opposite view on these matters! We demand that in the future you do not assume the role of the spokesman for all ethnic minorities in the CSFR. We believe that you are not authorized to speak on behalf of all Hungarians living in our republic either. We are convinced that a great part of ordinary people of Hungarian nationality living in the CSFR, too, disagree with the idea of returning land [nationalized] since the year 1945. You are making a bid for property that does not belong to you and dragging into your political games even minorities that absolutely disagree with you.

Carnugovsky Concerned About Slovak Government

LD1804164291 Prague Domestic Service in Czech 1430 GMT 18 Apr 91

[Text] Jan Carnogursky, first deputy Slovak prime minister and chairman of the Christian Democratic Movement [KDH], expressed in Bratislava today his concern about the further ability of the Slovak government to function, as there are disagreements between Vladimir Meciar, Jozef Kucerak, and Vladimir Ondrus, and also among other members of the government, followers of one or other platform of the Public Against Violence.

Jan Carnogursky confirmed that the KDH insists on settling state legislative relations between the republics by a state treaty. In this way, he raised an objection against the inexact statement of presidential spokesman Michael Zantovsky about yesterday's talks in Lany; Zantovsky said that the KDH does not insist on the state treaty. This further inaccuracy in the statements of Mr Zantovsky evokes, in the words of Jan Carnogursky, doubts about his competence to be a spokesman of the president.

Alliance Between Meciar Faction, Democrats Viewed

AU1704153691 Bratislava NARODNA OBRODA in Slovak 15 Apr 91 p 3

[Igor Cibula commentary: "The Will To Find a Compromise Is Missing"]

[Text] As far as the political dispute concerning Vladimir Meciar's continuation in his office as Slovak prime minister is concerned, the deadlock situation has still not changed. It is not easy to find a solution that would not complicate future developments in Slovakia. The unwillingness—or rather, the inability—of the Public Against Violence [VPN] movement's disorganized factions to agree on a mutually acceptable compromise has become protracted, although the conflict's main protagonists are trying to convince the public that they are seeking a rational starting point to eliminate its uncompromisingly confrontationist nature. The anti-Meciar campaign—amply supported from Prague sources—does not arouse hope of more optimistic expectations. Into the bargain, anxieties about increasing complications in Czech-Slovak relations are added to this.

The Slovak National Council [SNR]—as the constitutionally most competent organ—is to make a decision on whether Prime Minister Vladimir Meciar is capable of executing his office. This right belongs statutorily to the SNR Presidium, which appoints and recalls the prime minister and other government members. The Presidium cannot remove Meciar from office without the agreement of Christian Democratic Movement [KDH] deputies; therefore, the key to future developments in Slovakia is held by KDH representatives. If they were to accept the VPN Slovak Council's arguments against

Meciar, they could not only decide his fate, but—at the same time—they could also take on the responsibility for further steps in dealing with the government crisis.

It is justifiably possible to assume that if Meciar and Minister Milan Knazko are recalled the other ministers from the For a Democratic Slovakia platform and ministers from the Democratic Party would also resign. Several indicators, first and foremost, the resolute support given to the prime minister by the Democrats in the past few days—they have even put regular space in their party daily CAS [TIME] at the disposal of the VPN-For a Democratic Slovakia platform—provides the inspiration for this interpretation. That is, a political alliance of democratic center forces—an alliance that would certainly become significant in future elections—is now being mapped out.

Meciar's successor in the office of prime minister could be a politician from among the KDH's ranks, because this movement is currently the most stable factor in the government coalition. Its well balanced orientation provides a guarantee that developments in Slovakia in the very near future will avoid extremes. The burden of prime ministerial obligations does not have to be borne by Jan Carnogursky, however, because taking over from Meciar would not make him too popular. The issue does not involve his own popularity, but, rather, involves avoiding the risks associated with resolving the topical problems caused by radical economic reform.

The crux of the deadlock situation on the current Slovak political scene lies in the fact that, by replacing Meciar, there could be a threat of a minority government. His continuation in the office of prime minister, however,—while maintaining the current confrontationist situation within the VPN movement—considerably paralyzes the course of action that may be taken to deal with the topical social problems that continue to accumulate. The prospects for development in the very near future depend on how successful all the interested parties are in placing Slovakia's interests above their own party and personal political aims.

Carnogursky Views Possibility of 'State Treaty'

AU1704113391

[Editorial Report] Prague LIDOVA DEMOKRACIE in Czech on 9 April on pages 1 and 3 carries a 2,000-word interview with Jan Carnogursky, Slovak first deputy prime minister and chairman of the Christian Democratic Movement [KDH], by LIDOVA DEMOKRACIE reporter Libor Jan. The interview, the place and date of which are not given, is published under the headline "Slovak Struggle for Stability."

Jan Carnogursky is first asked about his "view of the present political turmoil in Slovakia." He says that it is because of the absence of Slovak state institutions with a long tradition. This accounts for the "spasmodic, highly emotional, and unstable political life in Slovakia." Carnogursky describes the processes taking place in Slovakia as a "struggle for stability and legitimacy" and expresses the hope that "stability will be achieved by legitimate means."

Asked about his view of the split in the Public Against Violence [VPN] movement, Carnogursky says that, despite the KDH's "doubts" about the VPN's stability as a partner, it sees no alternative to its coalition with both VPN factions as "otherwise the Slovak government would have to rely in the Slovak National Council on communist deputies, deputies of the Slovak National Party, and Hungarian deputies."

Next, Carnogursky clarifies the KDH's proposal for a state treaty between the Czech Republic and the Slovak Republic. He disagrees with the view of Czech Prime Minister Pithart and Czech National Council Chairwoman Buresova that a state treaty can be concluded only between two sovereign states and that such a treaty would, therefore, "disrupt the legal continuity of our state." Carnogursky argues that a treaty can be concluded between any "entities having their own legal status," which is the case of both the Czech Republic and the Slovak Republic. Besides, both the Czech Republic and the Slovak Republic are "states." He concedes, however, that the treaty concluded between them would not necessarily have to have the status of "an international treaty of the highest type." Moreover, the KDH would not insist on the document being called a state treaty, which is only its "working title." Carnogursky does not believe that the treaty would "disrupt the legal continuity" of Czechoslovakia. It would merely "renew the already existing treaty" as expressed in the preamble to the Law on Czechoslovak Federation of 1968.

Asked whether Moravia, too, could be a party to this treaty, Carnogursky "does not rule out this possibility." He personally would even "welcome it if Moravia gained a certain independent status. The analysis of election results in Moravia shows that Christian-oriented parties would have quite good electoral chances in Moravia and in this case Moravia and Slovakia might even form some kind of a bloc in the future—at least politically and ideologically—that would be able to more effectively enforce its political ideas concerning non-Christian political parties, which are likely to have a rather strong standing in Bohemia." Carnogursky adds, however, that in the event of a treaty between Bohemia, Moravia, and Slovakia, "Slovakia would demand certain guarantees that it cannot be outvoted on important matters."

The LIDOVA DEMOKRACIE reporter also inquires about the KDH's future as a movement. Carnogursky replies that "we will try to retain the form of a movement as long as possible and will transform ourselves into a party only when it turns out to be inevitable." Speaking about the benefits of the "organizational looseness" of a movement, Carnogursky points out that "it permits, for example, the existence of a Protestant section. This section now wants to establish its own platform, which is quite useful."

One question concerns Carnogursky's "lack of popularity" among the public. The KDH chairman replies that the most important thing is a "correct policy," while popularity is only secondary. He agrees with the reporter's observation that German Chancellor Kohl and the ruling German CDU/CSU [Christian Democratic Union/Christian Social Union] coalition are not very popular either. Nonetheless, the people vote for them because of their "rational and responsible policy."

In concluding, Carnogursky is asked to comment on the KDH's relationship with its "natural partners" in the Czech Republic—the Czechoslovak People's Party [CSL] and the Christian Democratic Party [KDS]. He replies that the KDH, the CSL, and the KDS share a "common ideological foundation." On the other hand, they are "set apart" by the fact that they represent the inhabitants of two republics "whose interests are not completely identical." Carnogursky says that the KDH's lower-level contacts with the CSL and the KDS are more intensive than their high-level contacts. He singles out, however, his "very good cooperation" with KDS Chairman Vaclav Benda, with whom he shares a dissident past.

Minister Knazko on Slovak International Relations

AU1704125591 Bratislava PRAVDA in Slovak 13 Apr 91 p 3

["(ro)"-signed report: "Slovakia at a Disadvantage"]

[Text] Bratislava—In his introductory statement at yesterday's news conference, Slovak Foreign Relations Minister Milan Knazko once again briefly summarized events in recent weeks, during which Slovak representatives met with representatives of foreign countries, either on home turf or on official visits.

When answering journalists' questions, he pointed to the campaign that has become apparent in some foreign periodicals in recent months. "We have drawn Minister Dienstbier's attention to the fact that defamation of Slovakia is also defamation of the Czechoslovak federation.... We deem it necessary that information explaining the matter should be published," said M. Knazko. His deputy, Roman Zelenay, stated that—based on facts acquired from Czechoslovak embassies—officials from Czechoslovak embassies have—due to the late distribution of the press—no objective information about developments in the CSFR.

In connection with the Czech Prime Minister's instruction about the need for members of the Slovak government to arrange their trips abroad through the Federal Ministry of Foreign Affairs—which were broadcast on television the previous day—M. Knazko stressed that all trips are arranged with the knowledge of the Federal Ministry of Foreign Affairs. He pointed to the fact that, for example, Slovak representatives were reproached with harming the interests of the federation when they were received in Germany at the same level as the Czech delegation was recently received in Austria.

When asked about his opinion on the meeting between F. Gal and German Foreign Minister H. D. Genscher in Prague, he said that the protocol [department] was not informed about it, as is usual for Prague to do in similar cases. He expressed his regret that representatives of other—coalition or opposition—parties did not have the opportunity to take part in such a meeting.

On the subject of the intended establishment of a Russian-Slovak commercial bank he said that Russian experts have already been in Bratislava, Slovak experts will go to Moscow now, and in several weeks the institute may start operating. He also spoke about foreign assistance from developed countries, particularly from the United States, Canada, Great Britain, France, Italy, and Switzerland. In these cases direct financial assistance—multi-million sums of dollars—is not involved at all, but the assistance involves granting relief on the interest repayment to entrepreneurs in the aforementioned countries, who will be willing to economically cooperate with our entrepreneurs and enterprises.

Minister Knazko pointed out on multiple occasions that Slovakia is not a full-fledged subject of international law as an independent state, and that all its foreign policy activity is carried out in harmony with the federation's objectives, but on a regional level, of course.

Slovak Parties View Constitutional Procedure

AU1704100391 Bratislava NARODNA OBRODA in Slovak 11 Apr 91 pp 1, 2

[CTK report: "Coalition Roundtable on the Premises of the Hungarian Independent Initiative"]

[Excerpt] Bratislava— After more than two hours of talks among representatives of parties and movements making up the Slovak government coalition, which were held behind closed doors, Hungarian Independent Initiative [MNI] Chairman Laszlo Nagy informed journalists about their course.

Participants in the roundtable talks were Juraj Flamik, chairman of the Public Against Violence [VPN] Coordinating Center; Christian Democratic Movement [KDH] Chairman Jan Carnogursky; MNI Chairman Laszlo Nagy; Ivan Brndiar, deputy to the Slovak National Council for the Democratic Party; and Prime Minister Meciar for the VPN-For a Democratic Slovakia platform.

Laszlo Nagy characterized the talks as calm and constructive and confirmed that their originally set agenda was fulfilled. Referring to the problem of the drafting of the Slovak Republic constitution, he said that the [coalition] parties and movements had reached a consensus in that the drafts would not be published prior to their

consideration in the Slovak National Council. The politicians agreed that the process of appraisal concerning the [drafts of the] constitution should be completed by 30 June.

Asked whether the subjects of discussion included also the present domestic political situation, Laszlo Nagy replied: "I will not tell you anything sensational or interesting. The debate on this issue was very brief. The participants in the roundtable agreed not to discuss problems in the government and problems concerning the person of Prime Minister Meciar before the results of [investigations initiated by] the Slovak National Council Presidium and Slovak National Council committees become known. [passage omitted]

SNR Chairman on Need for 'Extensive Solution'

AU1704100791 Bratislava NARODNA OBRODA in Slovak 12 Apr 91 pp 1, 2

[G. Beer, B. Izarik report: "On Problems of Enterprises and the Government"]

[Excerpt] Kosice— Slovak National Council [SNR] Chairman Frantisek Miklosko and Slovak Deputy Prime Minister Jozef Kucerak continued their working visit to East Slovakia yesterday.

At a news conference in Kosice, F. Miklosko stressed that the aim of the visit was to accentuate the political importance of the region and of Kosice. [passage omitted] Asked by NARODNA OBRODA about the situation between the legislature and the government, F. Miklosko said: "We realize that the government is facing enormous problems, that its members work from sunrise to sunset." Nonetheless, the SNR chairman voiced dissatisfaction with the construction sector, in which he misses a concept, and with the Ministry of Labor and Social Affairs, which has done very little in the nine months [since the government's appointment]. "The problem of the government is bigger than that, and it will require a more extensive solution. The problem of [Justice] Minister Kosta and his deed [in the SNR on 20 March when he voted for two absent deputies] also belongs here, of course. It is obvious that everything will have to be dealt with soon...." F. Miklosko said. [passage omitted]

Slovak Polls See Paradoxes in Political Attitudes

AU1704093991 Prague MLADA FRONTA DNES in Czech 12 Apr 91 p 2

[Ivo Slavik commentary: "Slovak Paradoxes"]

[Text] Sociological polls conducted by the Comenius University Institute for Social Analysis in Bratislava have uncovered a number of paradoxes on the Slovak political scene. These paradoxes can be interpreted as the consequence of immature political knowledge or as a result of Meciar's populist propaganda. Both alternatives are valid. Otherwise it would not be possible that supporters of different, and even opposite, parties would have regrouped as his supporters—Slovak National Party, Weiss' leftist Party of the Democratic Left, and the Democratic Party.

Unfavorable initial conditions for the development of democracy in Slovakia are noticeable even in how little weight is ascribed to parliamentary democracy. On a scale running from social securities to the influx of foreign capital, it gained a place somewhere in the middle. The respondents considered rapid privatization, entry into the European Community, and the aforementioned foreign capital even less important. Potential voters for the Slovak Party of the Democratic Left and some categories of citizens who, to a greater extent, express their confidence in Meciar showed tendency to underestimate the importance of parliamentary democracy.

By the way, when talking about these people, it is necessary to stress their willingness to use extreme means, including strikes and hunger strikes. This also pertains to the supporters of the "For a Democratic Slovakia" platform. Readiness to use radical forms of pressure, however, calls into question the very name of Meciar's—and today, unfortunately, majority—faction of the Public Against Violence [VPN] movement—"For a Democratic Slovakia" platform....

The attitude of the public toward the presence of President Havel at the meeting [on Slovak National Uprising Square, commemorating the independent Slovak State] on 14 March is also linked to the fragility of Slovakia's parliamentary democracy. Citizens who think that the president's presence was a provocation (45 percent) are mostly supporters of the Slovak National Party, the Party of the Democratic Left, and the VPN movement-For a Democratic Slovakia platform. The fact that more than 20 percent of the respondents approved of the reaction to the presidents's arrival testifies to the "infantile diseases of democracy." We should not forget that the novelty of solving problems by discussion and intolerance are not a privilege of the Slovak society alone. Every day we can find evidence that impatience and radicalism do not shun Bohemia either.

Another strange feature of Slovak politics is that a great number of Christian Democratic Party and Democratic Party supporters—that is, the two government parties responsible for economic reform—deem it important to slow down economic reform. These opinions, together with the emphasis on retaining social securities while there is a shortage in reserves, threaten the realization of the federal program of economic reform. At the same time, they create prerequisites for further intensifying the differences between the two economies.

Defense Minister Views Nuclear Ammunition Storage

LD1604174691 Prague CTK in English 1642 GMT 16 Apr 91

[Text] Prague April 16 (CTK)—Czechoslovak Defence Minister Lubos Dobrovsky told the Armed Forces and Security Committees of the Federal Assembly today that nuclear ammunition was most likely stored at three sites controlled by the Soviet Army in Czechoslovakia.

The minister was answering an interpellation which demanded an explanation of a December 1965 agreement between the Czechoslovak and Soviet Governments on raising the combat preparedness of rocket forces and another one from 1986 on bases with nuclear ammunition on Czechoslovak territory. The existence of the agreements remained secret until recently although they concerned the sovereignty and security of the state and the life of its population, the deputies who raised the question said.

Three sites were established on the basis of the 1965 agreement in west and northwest Bohemia, at Bilina, Bela Pod Bezdezem and Misov. The minister said there was no evidence that nuclear ammunition had been stored there, nor any radioactivity recordings to prove it, but with regard to the good operating condition of the sites it is more than certain that nuclear ammunition was there.

The minister confirmed that the agreements, which were valid for an indefinite period, were marked "classified". He said he would ask the Federal Government to contact the Soviet Government in an effort to make the agreements public.

The installations were built by Czechoslovakia, with an investment of more than 208 million crowns [korunas]. Although they were then under Soviet Government supervision and under the control of the Soviet Army command, Czechoslovakia financed their operation at a total cost of 226 million crowns over the whole period.

Dobrovsky said the installation has now been taken over by the Czechoslovak Army. A protocol of October 1990 provides for the termination of the agreement by a special accord to be signed when the last Soviet troops leave Czechoslovakia.

Soviet forces have been based in Czechoslovakia since the August 1968 Warsaw Pact invasion which crushed the country's reform movement. Under a February 1990 accord between Czechoslovakia and the Soviet Union all Soviet troops are to leave by the end of next June. At the moment about 10,000 remain in Czechoslovakia to complete the pull-out and according to a Soviet commander all will leave already by the end of May.

Dobrovsky gave information on professional tests administered to the highest staff of the Czechoslovak Army to assess the degree of their loyalty to the state leadership and their ability to handle the new tasks involved in state defence and to gain public confidence.

According to Dobrovsky, most of the generals proved to be good military experts who retained a high sense of responsibility for the country's defence. However, Dobrovsky acknowledged that their political thinking is one-sided as a result of the long influence of the past regime.

The minister said that reasons for dismissal from military service were not found in any of the cases but reshuffles will have to be made. In the next few weeks changes will be carried out in the Czechoslovak Army General Staff. They will not constitute a purge and their purpose will be to stabilize the Army command, Dobrovsky said.

He said the Army was poorly equipped, especially in the areas of command, communications, reconnaissance and radio technology, and said that the Air Force was outdated too.

Some 18,000 people have been released from the Army after they applied for civilian duty and this reduces the Army's ability to fight, he said. (Those who wish to perform civilian duty as an alernative to military service serve 27 months instead of 18.).

Goncz, Bulgaria's Zhelev Sign Political Statement

LD1804135191 Budapest MTI in English 1256 GMT 18 Apr 91

[Text] Budapest, April 18 (MTI)—President of the Republic of Hungary Arpad Goncz and President of the Republic of Bulgaria Zhelyu Zhelev, currently staying in Hungary on an official visit, signed a political statement on the future development of ties between Hungary and Bulgaria in the Hungarian parliament on Thursday [18 April].

In its introduction, the statement welcomes the historic changes in Europe that have brought the era of confrontation and opposing blocs to an end.

Both sides firmly state that the security of the two countries is inseparable from the security of all countries participating in the European Conference of Security and Cooperation.

The signatories state that the territorial integrity of European states and the inviolability of their borders are integral factors for the peace of the world.

Outlining the basic principles for reviving relations between the two countries, the statement stresses that Hungary and Bulgaria strive for a wide-ranging and balanced co-operation. The two states will co-operate closely in further developing the human dimension of the Helsinki process.

Confirming the Paris Charter, they state that the friendly ties between their peoples, the ideas of peace, justice, stability and democracy demand the assertion and guaranteeing of the ethnic, cultural, language and religious identity of national, ethnic or religious minorities.

In accordance with their countries, laws, they guarantee individual rights and freedoms for all those belonging to national minorities.

Hungary and Bulgaria strive to promote a mutually advantageous economic co-operation, by using modern forms and methods. They support the exchange of cultural values, the free flow of information, and the maintenance and preservation of their cultural heritage and the historic sites to be found in their territories.

Foreign Affairs Chairman Views Moscow Visit

AU1704120591 Budapest NEPSZABADSAG in Hungarian 13 Apr 91 pp 2, 3

[Interview with Gyula Horn, chairman of the National Assembly Foreign Affairs Committee, by Istvan Zalai; place and date not given: "Horn: To Dispel Misunderstandings"—first paragraph is NEPSZABADSAG introduction]

[Excerpts] Under the leadership of Gyula Horn, a six-party delegation from Hungary's parliamentary foreign affairs committee will be leaving for Moscow tomorrow [14 April]. We asked Horn about the aims of this visit.

[Horn] This will be the first meeting at this level with the foreign affairs committee of the Supreme Soviet, and with the legislatures of the Russian Federation and the Ukraine. We are also scheduled to visit the Soviet Foreign Affairs Ministry and Foreign Trade Ministry [as published] during our stay in Moscow. Our most important aim is to make it clear that Hungary wants to establish good relations on a new basis with the Soviet Union. We would like to make clear that any speculations concerning a Hungarian anti-Soviet policy are unfounded, and we would like to dispel certain misunderstandings concerning Hungary's foreign policy aims.

[Zalai] To what are you referring?

[Horn] For example, if Hungary, Poland, and the CSFR are striving for closer cooperation, then that is not aimed against the Soviet Union; indeed, it is in the Soviet Union's own interest that these three countries stabilize their situation. The most sensitive question is the type of security policy that Hungary should develop after the disbanding of the Warsaw Pact. I think that, in this area, there are certain misunderstandings or incomprehensions in the Soviet Union. For instance, there are debates to determine whether Hungary should be able to join any kind of alliance. In my opinion, in its section on the sovereignty of states, the Helsinki Final Act—which applies to both the Soviet Union and Hungary—determines the political, military, and economic groups to which each country is linked. Clearly, it would not be in our interest if the Soviet Union were to feel any kind of threat. Without becoming members of the military organization, however, I am convinced that close cooperation with NATO is inseparable from a reevaluation of European security and cooperation, and all this is not aimed against the Soviet Union.

[Zalai] A few days ago, you publicly stated that in Moscow, you wished to broach the subject of a potential refugee overflow. You said that Hungary might have to introduce unilateral compulsory visas to avoid this problem.

[Horn] I never said that compulsory visas were the only way to avoid a possible overflow of refugees. I have stated in the past—and I still believe—that we need to discuss this issue with the Soviets. Nobody knows exactly when the Soviet Union will pass its law concerning the introduction of a world passport, and even less is known about the carrying out of this law. In other words, we have to find out about all that. Furthermore, the Soviet Union would definitely be concerned if hundreds of thousands—or even millions—of its citizens started to move, heading for countries located west of the Soviet Union. This phenomenon could cause the Soviet Union serious problems; therefore, the Soviet Union could help prevent the development of an impossible situation in some of its neighboring countries by acting as a partner. I would like to be perfectly understood: I

would not be pleased if we had to introduce compulsory visas; however, everybody should understand that Hungary could not cope with a new influx of tens of thousands of refugees—let alone hundreds of thousands—regardless of where these refugees would be coming from. [passage omitted]

[Zalai] Could it be said that the visit of your delegation to Moscow and the Hungarian Government's more active dealings with the Soviet Union complement each other?

[Horn] Absolutely. I feel as though our previous proposals have received a response. I am referring to criticisms of various government statements that caused unnecessary disturbances in our relations, or to the fact that we lacked an active government in political dialogue. On the whole, Hungary's six parliamentary parties agree—at least, within the foreign affairs committee—that it is of vital importance to improve our relations with the Soviet Union, and I do not suppose that the government is of a different opinion right now. [passage omitted]

Assembly Committee Told of Soviet Withdrawal

LD1704194891 Budapest MTI in English 1824 GMT 17 Apr 91

[Text] Budapest, April 17 (MTI)—In its closed session on Wednesday, the Defence Committee of parliament reaffirmed the proposal put forward by the Ministry of Defence and the Hungarian Army on the defence principles of the Republic of Hungary.

Lieutenant General Antal Annus, state secretary of defence, gave updates on the Soviet troops pull-out and the negotiations on accounting methods. He said the Soviet troops were being withdrawn as scheduled in the inter-governmental agreement. Up to now, 85 per cent of the troops have left Hungarian territory. The military equipment is being moved out more quickly than planned, Annus said.

Slovakia's Miklosko on Improving Relations

AU1804083391 Budapest MAGYAR NEMZET in Hungarian 16 Apr 91 p 6

[Bethlenfalvy report: "We Should Reconcile Our Differences Together"]

[Text] Slovak National Council Chairman Frantisek Miklosko paid a private visit to Hungary during the weekend [13-14 April] and had talks about the questions of Slovak-Hungarian relations with certain representatives of the Hungarian Christian intelligentsia. The meeting was organized by the Catholic Academy of Social Sciences.

Slovak nationalism was the first subject. Miklosko explained that the Slovak people's basic trauma is that, throughout their history, they could not attain an independent statehood, apart from one occasion and that was under Hitler's wings. A feeling of danger reinforces their anxiety, and, in addition to the traditional prejudices, the irredentism appearing in certain Hungarian, Polish, and Ukrainian circles contributes to this. The third factor is the emerging dissatisfaction and mental void that followed the euphoric days after the liberation from communism.

It could reduce the tension in Hungarian-Slovak relations if Hungary treated Slovakia as an equal partner—said Miklosko. He appreciated [Hungarian National Assembly Chairman] Gyorgy Szabad's gesture, who agreed to the setting up of a joint committee by the Hungarian and Slovak legislatures to look into sensitive points. According to the plan, the committee would wind up with a joint statement by the two legislatures and by signing a new agreement on cooperation.

Speaking of the future of the CSFR, Miklosko said that he was not expecting the Republic to break up but the confederation to be placed on new foundations. He would consider it desirable, however, for an independent Slovak nation to be present in a united Europe of the future.

Instead of protocol statements, we should place the emphasis in Hungarian-Slovak relations on moral gestures—he continued. The church could play an important role in this.

Answering a remark that, recently, Hungarian language signs had been knocked down in several southern Slovak towns, Miklosko said that the law made it compulsory to use Slovak language signs, but it did not ban the coexistence of other language signs. Interpreting the law in a different way, the Slovak interior affairs minister did not intervene against those knocking down the signs. For this reason, after warning the minister of the danger of possible aggravation, the chairman of the National Council referred the question of interpreting the law to the Supreme Court of Justice.

Finance Minister Interviewed on London Talks

AU1804095191 Budapest MTI in English 1247 GMT 17 Apr 91

[Text] Budapest, 17 Apr (MTI)—The new European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD) is interested in finding answers to the current problems the collapse of Comecon is causing in East European trade, answers which will eventually lead to the creation of an East European Payments Union.

Hungary holds that this will be a long drawn-out process, though, and feels it would be more expedient to kick off by setting up two funds with EBRD assistance to bridge the Hungarian-Soviet payment problems, Hungarian Finance Minister Mihaly Kupa told MTI's London correspondent today.

Earlier, a senior official from the Hungarian Ministry of Finance expressed scepticism that a Central and East European financial and payments union could be set up in the near future.

The Hungarian Government believes that the conditions for such a regional payments system are simply not there, and feels that the settlement of bilateral payment problems with the Soviet Union is a prerequisite for establishing the system.

There are also fears in Hungary that an East European regional payments system would result in member countries, becoming isolated.

There is also the risk that different prices would develop within the system, thereby discouraging companies from exporting outside the system.

Mr Kupa said that following the discussions Prime Ministers Jozsef Antall of Hungary and Valentin Pavlov of the Soviet Union held in Britain on Sunday, he had agreed with Soviet Deputy Finance Minister Vsevolod Sitnin on Tuesday that experts of the two governments would, in ten days' time, begin coordinating proposals which serve to bridge bilateral payment problems.

Ideas to be discussed include inter-company cooperation, barter deals, the acceptance of each others, currencies within agreed limits, and the operation of the EBRD trade financing fund.

Commenting on the talks between Antall and U.S. Treasury Secretary Nicholas Brady, Kupa said that Brady had agreed to look into how Hungarian firms could participate in Middle East reconstruction projects following the Gulf war.

Finance Minister on Future Economic Prospects

AU1804174791 Budapest 168 ORA in Hungarian 16 Apr 91 pp 8, 9

[Interview with Finance Minister Mihaly Kupa by Zoltan Farkas; place and date not given: "Trap With Ways Out—The Traveling Finance Minister—Interests Implemented With Difficulty"—first paragraph is 168 ORA introduction]

[Excerpts] Naturally, during the preparations for the six-party talks, one should not disregard the government's present and anticipated opinion. Inevitably, one must ask the opinion of the cabinet minister whose professional knowledge won him general esteem. Zoltan Farkas interviewed Mihaly Kupa.

[Farkas] So far, one does not see the place of the government in a six-party agreement. Proposals have already been made from all sides as regards the subjects to agree upon. Issues like how to manage the debt crisis and what anti-inflationary policy to conduct are among these proposals. In your view, how could the six parties come to an agreement without involving the government? Should they negotiate by including the government?

[Kupa] I do not have a clear picture in spite of the fact that, upon my return from abroad, I spoke with the prime minister and [Federation of Young Democrats (FIDESZ) official] Viktor Orban about this. The way I see it, the idea is that agreement should be achieved on major issues at these negotiations, and not on how to manage our debts. This is a professional rather than a political issue. This should be handled by banking and other methods.

[Farkas] On what is it possible to come to an agreement then?

[Kupa] On economic and ownership basic issues; on finding a consensus regarding our principles. One should see whether individual parties can see to it that their factions accept the agreement because, as I see it, this is generally hard to do, no matter which party we are talking about, except for the FIDESZ. [passage omitted]

[Farkas] At a news conference held in Germany, you said about the possibility of joining the European Community that the Germans were helping us but one could already see that Portugal, Spain, and Greece were making up the group of countries that hinder our efforts.

[Kupa] Those with whom I spoke—the Dutch, Belgians, British, Germans, and French—support Hungary's efforts to join the EEC. Among them, some countries support Hungary's demand to have much greater opportunities in the areas of agriculture and food industry than they currently do. There are people who do not support this, or they say that the issue is extremely complex. There are the southern countries with different interests, not only in the agricultural and food industry sectors, but also in redistribution of development sources because, as backward areas, they receive huge infrastructure funds. [passage omitted]

[Farkas] When will these talks lead to results, and what results can these negotiations lead to?

[Kupa] To be associate EEC members by 1 January, together with Poland and the CSFR, negotiations must conclude by the end of July because the governments of all the 12 member countries must ratify the agreement. I follow these negotiations with some concern because, in my opinion, we are unable to adequately assert the Hungarian interests; at least, this has been my impression so far. This is one of the reasons I traveled abroad. [passage omitted]

[Farkas] You planned a big deficit in our balance of payments for the first quarter of this year, and we now have a surplus. National Bank President Gyorgy Suranyi said that Hungary's hard currency reserves were higher than at any time in the recent past. Contrary to the predictions of the Kupa program, the price of crude has

not increased. If I am correct, our budget situation is also slightly better than expected. What does all this mean?

[Kupa] This favorable process is the result of two things. One is the fact that the entrepreneurs and people in this country are working hard and are able to find ways to extricate themselves from the difficult situation. The other thing is that we succeeded in conducting a policy that minimized government interference in the economy. Our economy has become free: The government no longer bothers and pesters the economy but tries to guide it with modern methods. This does not mean that we are now full of money, because our Eastern trade will continue to be problematic even if we find solutions. The price of crude is also increasing in the world market, and we have big structural problems. It would be a big mistake to think that we are now coming up with a lower inflation after the first quarter of this year and we are trying to create a better mood among the population by starting to distribute all kinds of funds. This is not so because, in this case, we would destroy everything again. Our budget deficit amounts to 22 billion forints. If we regard this in perspective, this roughly corresponds to the planned annual deficit of 79 billion, and there are no more dispensable funds in our budget. There is a certain government reserve of seven billion forints controlled by the National Assembly. I want the National Assembly to continue to control this fund, and I would prefer not to have arguments on hundreds of millions of forints at every government session. We must not fall into the illusion that the situation is good now. Our situation is improving, but it is far form being good. We still have a long way to go.

Personal ID Numbers Ruled 'Anticonstitutional'

LD1704091391 Budapest MTI in English 0649 GMT 17 Apr 91

[Text] Budapest, April 17 (MTI)—The latest issue of the Hungarian MAGYAR KOZLONY (OFFICIAL GAZETTE) publishes the ruling of the Constitutional Court on the anti-constitutional nature of the personal identification numbers, and on abolishing the compulsory use of these codes.

Both state and non-state data processors are obliged to discontinue this anti-constitutional process. Only the state population registry office is entitled to provide new identification numbers, by December 31, 1991, and to use those, together with the existing ones, as internal identification, runs the ruling of the court.

According to the reasons given, the law-decree on personal identification numbers clearly reflects the intention of setting up an integrated personal data bank, which would include all data pertaining to the citizens: health, financial standing, official data, and so on. This would completely lay the citizens open to data processors, providing a clear picture about their private lives. An irregular, lopsided situation would thus come about, in which the person concerned would not be aware what the data processors know about his or her life.

Prime Minister Bielecki Views Soviet Ties

PM1804075991 Gdansk DZIENNIK BALTYCKI in Polish 8 Apr 91 pp 1, 2

[Interview with Prime Minister Jan Krzysztof Bielecki by Barbara Madajczk-Krasowska; place and date not given: "Export, Import, Account Settlement: Jan Krzysztof Bielecki on Economic Relations With USSR"]

[Text] [Madajczyk-Krasowska] Mr. Prime Minister, Poland buys oil and gas in the USSR. Since January [of] this year we have been paying for these goods in dollars, whereas the Soviet Union refuses to pay in convertible currencies for the goods it buys from us. In practical terms, this means putting a stop to our exporting Polish products there. Have you succeeded in sorting something out in this matter during your visit to Moscow?

[Bielecki] We are trying to find a solution that will be advantageous to both sides. We are glad that the Soviet side has come to appreciate that in our situation it is more advantageous to settle accounts on the principle of hard currency clearing and that we need to balance payments on each side. On the other hand, there arose the new question of what goods we can import from the Soviet Union apart from the commodity that we need most urgently—oil. We have been offered increased supplies of gas; however, we do not need any more gas, because the amounts we already import are sufficient to meet our needs. Consequently, we are looking for new commodities to import. I believe that a meeting of a working group will be held as soon as next week, with the aim of drafting a mutually agreed list of such goods. By the end of this month we must know whether we can achieve the proposed balance of trade.

[Madajczyk-Krasowska] Does this mean that the Russians will pay for our goods in dollars?

[Bielecki] The chances of our receiving payments in dollars are infinitesimal, because the financial liquidity of the Soviet Union's international accounts settlements is limited, to say the least.

[Madajczyk-Krasowska] If this is so, will we end up subsidizing our trade with them?

[Bielecki] We will not subsidize it; however, we shall study the possibility of changing over to barter account settlement. If there is no such possibility, we will import only essential commodities and provide credit only to the limit anticipated in our planned balance of payments—that is, up to $500 million.

[Madajczyk-Krasowska] If we fail to arrange for the settling of accounts according to a partners' agreement, will we stop our exports of food to the Soviet Union?

[Bielecki] This is a very difficult question because it ties in with the functioning of our domestic market and a humanitarian policy. At the moment I find it difficult to answer it clearly.

[Madajczyk-Krasowska] In the period between 15 December 1990 and 14 January 1991 we somehow accumulated an unplanned ruble [R] surplus of some 3.5 billion. Did you manage to ascertain its origin during your Moscow talks?

[Bielecki] According to my current information, the surplus in question has increased by R2 billion. This issue was raised by the Soviet side, since we were not interested in raising the problem for discussion. We can only surmise that certain enterprises wanted to get rid of their rubles, which represent "hot" money with a limited value, and to this end they sought to secure credits in Poland with a view to future goods deliveries.

[Madajczyk-Krasowska] What decisions were made in the matter of mutual debt liabilities?

[Bielecki] We submitted a so-called memorandum in which we presented a concrete proposal for balancing our mutual liabilities and obligations. Within this month we should determine the method of reciprocal settlement and—if this is feasible—the recalculation of our ruble surplus into convertible currencies.

[Madajczyk-Krasowska] The Soviet side declared that 10,000 Soviet servicemen would leave our country by the end of this year. Was a precise date quoted for the evacuation of the Soviet armed forces?

[Bielecki] There was talk about certain deadlines that still remain contentious. On the other hand, the Soviet side made a significant step forward by declaring its willingness to submit a detailed timetable or, as they call it, schedule, for the withdrawal of their armed forces. We will be able to draw conclusions from it regarding the scale and pace of the withdrawal operations, and also (most importantly) the type of the units being withdrawn. We can also discuss the establishment of a military mission in Poland, or the setting up of certain logistical units to back up the transit operations.

[Madajczyk-Krasowska] Thank you for talking to us.

Prime Minister, Unions Discuss Privatization

LD1804225391 Warsaw PAP in English 1718 GMT 18 Apr 91

[Text] Warsaw, April 18—Premier Jan Krzysztof Bielecki met here today with representatives of the Solidarity union organizations in Poland's major industrial plants to discuss questions connected with their privatization.

The problem is urgent since 80 percent of Poland's enterprises are still owned by the state and their financial situation determines the condition of the state budget.

Minister of Ownership Transformations Janusz Lewandowski, who also attended the meeting, told journalists that privatization of major state-owned plants was a very difficult process which had to be negotiated with workers and which should be understandable to them.

Today's meeting between the unionists and the premier was devoted to the search for common methods of privatization, he said, adding that he expected big industrial plants to show initiative and present their own concepts of privatization.

Presidential Aide on Domestic Political Scene

PM1804110191 Lodz GLOS PORANNY in Polish 6-7 Apr 91 pp 1, 4

[Interview with Presidential Adviser Jan Olszewski by Henryk Sroczynski; place and date not given: "Fall Is a Long Way Off Yet"]

[Text] [Sroczynski] You recently compared the Sejm to the Lithuania's National Salvation Committee. Why?

[Olszewski] You are asking something I know nothing about.

[Sroczynski] I read about it in an account of the inaugural meeting of the "Tradition and Future" political club.

[Olszewski] I am sorry, but I take no responsibility for information given in press accounts. I can only be responsible for my own words. In this case, during the meeting in question I spoke about something altogether different. I said that the nomenklatura is the dominant force in the Sejm, by virtue of holding two-thirds of all seats. I also spoke about the possibility that the situation in Lithuania—with which, after all, we are well acquainted—could in some ways influence the developments in our country, particularly a reactivation of certain forces that have been playing a specific role for the past 45 years. I also said that we could theoretically foresee a situation in which a National Salvation Committee—assuming that someone from the outside has come up with the idea of establishing such a body here—must face a Sejm in which a contingent of two-thirds of deputies represents the very forces derived from such a committee. This was the precise idea I discussed there. Any other interpretation of what I said is a falsification of the truth.

[Sroczynski] You did state the Poland's independence is under threat....

[Olszewski] You could draw such general conclusion from my address, but I wonder whether it would be correct. I made that claim in a specific context: If developments in the USSR take a turn toward a reversal of the processes taking place there now—such a reversal as we experienced in Poland in December 1981—then the threat to Poland is obvious.

[Sroczynski] There is still much talk about the influence wielded by the former nomenklatura. How do you see the chances of solving this problem?

[Olszewski] Yes, the problem does indeed exist. It is enough to visit provincial localities and listen to what people say. Is there a way of solving it? I believe that certain things were neglected and overlooked over the past 18 months or so, and it will be very difficult to correct them now. But I do not think that the situation is hopeless, and I expect that a new political configuration will be created in the central power apparatus after the next Sejm election. This will also certainly affect the situation in the whole system of local administration.

[Sroczynski] Many people still doubt that we have really and truly passed a turning point. Solidarity is being charged with responsibility for the state of affairs we are experiencing now.

[Olszewski] This is entirely normal. Solidarity accepted the burden of joint responsibility for the roundtable contract and brought its own representatives to the Sejm with a clearly defined legislative mandate—and even if it was the official authorities who have backed out of the contract, the resultant political consequences are, on the whole, blamed on Solidarity by a majority of public opinion.

[Sroczynski] How do you assess the use that Solidarity has made of the time it has had at its disposal?

[Olszewski] It would be a mistake to talk about Solidarity's failure to make good use of the time at its disposal. Although Solidarity took part in the roundtable contract negotiations—and also in the subsequent Sejm election—as a political partner or entity, in its later activity it returned, as it were, to its original trade union position. Responsibility for the subsequent development of the situation was assumed by our representatives in the Sejm and the Senate—that is, in the Citizens' Legislative Club, as well as the Tadeusz Mazowiecki government, or at least that section of the Mazowiecki government that could be described as "our own." It is really among this circle—and not in the Solidarity trade union—that we should look for the persons who carry the onus of political responsibility. Nevertheless, as I already said, public opinion does not make such distinctions. This is quite a natural reaction, although I do not say it is correct. And have we actually made good use of the past 18 months or so? My standpoint was made public by the fact that I signed the manifesto inaugurating the Center Alliance group—which, as you know, called out for acceleration as early as 1990. This also sums up my assessment of the situation.

[Sroczynski] Will the Center Accord succeed in energizing the public and encouraging it to implement the acceleration slogan on the strength of its program?

[Olszewski] I have not yet seen the Center Accord's program. Unfortunately, it has not yet been formulated.

[Sroczynski] Some of its future elements are already there and they are being publicly discussed. For many people, acceleration means nothing other than making shortcuts....

[Olszewski] We are not talking about shortcuts here. At the time of its formulation, the acceleration slogan meant an exhortation to the government to start working as it should.

[Sroczynski] The Center Accord is the force that supported Lech Walesa's candidacy in the presidential election. Today, however, it criticizes the government strongly, and collects "points" to use during the approaching legislative election. This opinion is shared by many politicians.

[Olszewski] I must say that you would have to show me documentary evidence to support your thesis. I certainly do not see any proof of the alleged scoring of points against the government by the Center Accord. Furthermore, the demand to present the election date is not an action directed against the government: It is directed against the present legislature, which should have been replaced long ago by a Sejm chosen in a genuine free election. After all, the present Sejm is just a "window-dressing" legislature. This really has nothing to do with the government.

[Sroczynski] With whom could the Center Accord set up a coalition for the election?

[Olszewski] Under the present circumstances, when the election has been delayed until the fall this year, your question is premature. From our perspective, fall is still a long way off.

[Sroczynski] When the subject is discussed, some people say that the Center Accord will not enter into a coalition with the liberals, or the Christian National Association....

[Olszewski] I believe that discussions on these issues are still premature. By this fall a number of crucial changes could take place on the political scene.

[Sroczynski] Could the postponement of the election date cause some political damage? It would have been to the Center Accord's advantage to have the election this spring....

[Olszewski] I believe that all sensibly minded people, all those who think in political terms, should realize that it is essential to have the election as soon as possible. This is not because of party interests, but because of state interests.

[Sroczynski] Is there no danger that the fall date for the election will be deferred even further?

[Olszewski] Of course there is such danger. We were in the vanguard in the reform process taking place in Europe, and we are still unable to have a free election almost two years after the essential turning point in our system. The fact that such elections have already been carried out in all countries of Eastern and Central Europe, except Albania, speaks for itself.

[Sroczynski] What role can the Left play in the legislative election?

[Olszewski] I do not wish to speak on this subject, because in my view the very concept of "the Left" is very unclear and unspecified. In addition, the concept of "post-communist forces" is becoming increasingly fluid.

[Sroczynski] Whom would the Center Accord regard as its principal rival?

[Olszewski] The principal rival of the political forces contending in the next election will be the public mood of apathy and despondency. This will be a very powerful opponent in the election, unless events take a turn that we cannot predict at this moment and that will change the currently advancing partial paralysis of the public opinion.

[Sroczynski] Do you think that the contending parties will place more emphasis on a battle between programs or a personal contest?

[Olszewski] I believe that political programs should be the weapons deployed in the contest. There is only one question: Which of the political forces involved will be capable of formulating such programs? Unfortunately, until now we had a situation in which political figures served as substitutes for programs. This is not good practice in a democratic system.

[Sroczynski] What, in your opinion, would be the best political configuration in the Sejm?

[Olszewski] The optimum political composition of the Sejm would accentuate the two or three tendencies that clearly dominate in the House. Organizational models are a secondary concern here. This definite majority could push the other, more diffuse political forces to the margins of Sejm life.

[Sroczynski] If the Center Accord wins the election and offers you the prime minister's portfolio, will you accept it?

[Olszewski] Please forgive me, but I believe that you have no grounds whatever for posing this question....

Council of Ministers Views Budget Crisis, Taxes

AU1804092691 Warsaw PAP in English 2141 GMT 16 Apr 91

[Text] Warsaw, April 16—At its weekly meeting here today the Council of Ministers discussed, among other things, the distribution of means for wages in the budgetary sphere, adopted the draft law on the national public administration school and introduced changes in the decree on lowering income tax on legal entities.

Under the governmental proposal the relation between wages in the budgetary and productive spheres [nonproductive and manufacturing state sectors] was to be 104 [to 100 percent] percent, but due to the tense budget it was lowered to 103 percent this year.

The final resolution of the Council of Ministers on the distribution of means for wages in individual branches of the budget-financed sector will be ready in the coming days.

The present budget shows a deep deficit, estimated at the moment at some 1.5 trillion zloties, government spokesman Adam Zarebski said after the meeting. This stems from much lower than planned revenues from income tax and a modest income from privatization.

The budgetary deficit calls for reduced expenditure. The government used such a blockade in mid-March for the first time, Zarebski added.

The Council of Ministers considered it an urgent task to increase discipline in paying obligations to the budget to eliminate the danger of its lasting imbalance. A special inter-ministerial team is to deal with the irregularities in this respect.

The draft law on the public administration school vests students with some of the rights and duties of a state official and subordinates the school to the prime minister.

The Council of Ministers also exempted invalids' cooperatives from income tax and resolved to lower the tax by 50 percent for publishers of non-commercial books.

Stock Exchange Reopens After Half Century

AU1804094491 Warsaw PAP in English 1719 GMT 16 Apr 91

[Text] Warsaw, April 16—Trading began today on the Warsaw stock exchange for the first time in 52 years, although the official opening is not to take place until June.

According to Wlodzimierz Magiela, deputy director of the Department for the Development of the Capital Market at the Ministry for Changes in Ownership Structure, the main purpose of this first day's trading was to determine market prices for shares in the five enterprises sold to the Polish public at the end of 1990.

As expected, shares in the construction company "Exbud" rose sharply above the issue price, to close at 149,000 zloty per share (issue price: 112,000 zloty). This represents a premium of 33 percent for those who used cash to buy the shares in January, and of almost 60 percent for those who took advantage of the discounts available if the shares were purchased using government savings bonds.

Shares in three other companies also showed gains over their issue prices. Shares in the clothing manufacturer "Prochnik" closed at 56,000 zloty (issue price: 50,000 zloty), representing a 12 percent gain for those who paid cash, and 34.5 percent for those using bonds.

Longin Darski, director of "Prochnik", admitted that he had expected the closing price to be lower, particularly after information had come to light that the firm had been over-valued by a few percent when the issue price had been set.

Audio equipment manufacturer "Tonsil" closed at 85,000 zloty (issue price: 80,000), a 6.25 percent premium for cash, and 27.5 percent for government bonds.

Glass-maker "Krosno" was the only company among the "five" to register a fall in share price. Prompted by news earlier this year of the company's restructuring problems, the closing price of 59,500 zloty (issue price: 65,000 zloty) represented a fall in value of 8.5 percent for cash investments, although those who had used government bonds to make the purchase were still able to register a profit of almost 10 percent.

"Turnover was light," said Wieslaw Rozlucki, chairman of the Warsaw Stock Exchange, announcing the quoted prices. "But we should note that we opened two months ahead of schedule, and that the banks are not yet accustomed to their new roles as market-makers."

Rozlucki had been apprehensive that orders from clients might not have been forthcoming, but in the event trading had been possible. "As a result, closing prices were set, and many transactions were concluded," he added.

Another trading day will be April 23.

French President Mitterrand Pays Official Visit

Begins Official Talks With Iliescu

AU1804173691 Bucharest Domestic Service in Romanian 1700 GMT 18 Apr 91

[Text] [Announcer] Concerning President Francois Mitterrand's visit to Romania—here is a telephone dispatch from Cotroceni Palace:

[Unidentified reporter] A short while after the French President's arrival in Bucharest, the first round of official talks between Messrs. Francois Mitterrand and Ion Iliescu took place at Cotroceni Palace. This event is regarded as a meeting of great opportunities and chances offered by history, under the current circumstances, to achieve a new dimension in developing and strengthening relations between France and Romania. Romanian-French friendship and cooperation thus acquires a new scope, with relations between the two countries being given strong impetus by the profound changes that have occurred not only in Romanian society, but also in international life.

We would like to point out that the Romanian-French summit dialogue has made an important comeback in recent years. In November 1990, while attending the high level CSCE meeting in Paris—a meeting that adopted a new Charter for Europe—Romanian President Ion Iliescu had a cordial meeting with French President Francois Mitterrand.

President Francois Mitterrand's visit to Romania and the talks held on this occasion will certainly mark a new and important point of reference for Romanian-French relations.

Bilateral Relations Discussed

AU1804203491 Bucharest Domestic Service in Romanian 1900 GMT 18 Apr 91

[Text] Immediately after the French President's arrival in Bucharest, official talks were held at Cotroceni Palace between Messrs. Francois Mitterrand and Ion Iliescu. The talks started with a tete-a-tete between the two presidents. They were later joined by the foreign ministers and the ambassadors of the two countries. Several (?key) points on the agenda of the two statesmen became quite apparent: First, a briefing by both sides on the political, social, and economic situation. In this respect, President Iliescu presented several relevant aspects about the Romanian situation and then referred to the problems of the reform and the consolidation of democracy, emphasizing the progress for the adoption of the Constitution in the Parliament. The second point on the agenda dealt with bilateral issues, which are taking a new course because of profound changes that have occurred not only in Romanian society, but in international life as well.

The talks emphasized the desire of the two sides to expand cooperation in all spheres. In this respect the French and Romanian foreign ministers, Messrs. Roland Dumas and Adrian Nastase, will exchange of letters tomorrow on the start of negotiations on a treaty of friendship, cooperation, and understanding between the two countries. A convention on youth problems and cadre training will also be signed. These documents, which will be signed tomorrow by the two foreign ministers, are a reflection of the desire for immediate cooperation in the sphere of bilateral ties.

As the French president is accompanied on this visit by a group of experts and businessmen, part of the talks dealt with economic cooperation in industry, agriculture, the creation of [word indistinct], and tourism. (?Since) overall talks concentrate on the fields of traditional cooperation between France and Romania, these aspects were also discussed by the two presidents. As a matter of fact, the French Cultural Center will be inaugurated in Iasi tomorrow in the presence of President Francois Mitterrand. Similar cultural centers will be opened in other cities. Romania will also have cultural centers in France.

During the talks at Cotroceni Palace, Romania's adherence to francophone culture was reiterated and appreciated. In this context, the sides confirmed our country's participation in the summit meeting of fracophone countries, which will take place in Paris next fall. Concerning international cooperation, the sides noted a close and (?at times) even similar way of tackling certain problems and positively assessed Romanian-French cooperation in certain European bodies, with emphasis on French support in the Council of Europe, the EEC, the recently created European Bank for Reconstruction and Development [words indistinct].

Confers With Prime Minister Roman

AU1804200791 Bucharest ROMPRES in English 1834 GMT 18 Apr 91

[Text] Bucharest ROMPRES, 18/4/1991—A meeting between President Francois Mitterrand and Prime Minister Petre Roman is under way at the residence reserved for the French head of state during his stay in Bucharest.

The meeting is a continuation of the talks previously conducted in Paris, during the Romanian premier's visit to France.

Meets With Intellectuals

AU1804174291 Bucharest Domestic Service in Romanian 1700 GMT 18 Apr 91

[Text] A short while ago, at the French Embassy, French President Francois Mitterrand had a meeting with Romanian intellectuals, including: Dan Haulica, Gabriel Liiceanu, Andrei Plesu, Mircea Dinescu, Doina Cornea, Victor Rebengiuc, Ion Caramitru, Ana Blandiana, Razvan Theodorescu, Mihnea Gheorghiu, Sergiu Nicolaescu, and Mihai Draganescu.

The meeting took place behind closed doors. No reporters were admitted, except for TV cameramen and Romanian and French photographers.

A group of citizens organized a demonstration in front of the embassy and chanted pro-monarchy slogans.

Palace Dinner Held; Iliescu Proposes Toast

AU1804201391 Bucharest ROMPRES in English 1900 GMT 18 Apr 91

[Report on toast by President Ion Iliescu at state dinner for visiting French President Francois Mitterrand in Bucharest on 18 April]

[Text] Bucharest ROMPRES, 18/4/1991—In the toast held at the dinner honouring French President Francois Mitterrand, Romania's President Ion Iliescu noted that the French head of state's visit to Romania acquires a special importance for at least three reasons: first, it is the very presence of President Mitterrand, "outstanding representative of a great friendly nation," secondly, because his visit to Romania comes as a proof of the brotherly feelings that have always united the two peoples and, lastly, because this visit is an omen of the radical changes that have occurred in Europe.

Pointing out that along history, "Romanians and French people have been on the same side of the barricade" at difficult times, President Iliescu showed that, from the first moments of the Romanian revolution, France and the French "have been on our side and extended to us their generous help." He also expressed his gratitude for the moral and material support granted to Romania in the post-revolutionary period, when the new political power in Romania had firmly embarked on building a new society based on the state of law, on the observance of the fundamental human rights and liberties, on a market economy.

Stressing that democracy is an irreversible option of the Romanian people, and that, since the May 20, 1990 elections, the Romanian society has undergone deep changes that lay the foundations for a civil society inspired by the values of institutionalised democracy, President Iliescu said: "We are, of course, aware of the road that lies ahead of us, as we have now entered an ample and complex historical process, supposed to lead us from an over- centralised system to a completely different one, based on the values of the free world. We are therefore crossing a transition period that can follow no previously tested patterns and methods apt to guarantee success". President Iliescu also made the remark that this process in Romania started on the background of a profound crisis inherited from the totalitarian regime and that this affected the country's whole social and economic life, only to be worsened by the spiritual and moral crisis, as another consequence of the dictatorship.

"Our opening to a deeply democratic country with a strong culture, like France, said President Ion Iliescu, cannot but help us surmount this critical situation."

The president expressed his hope that France, faithful to her ideals of freedom, equality and fraternity, would encourage and support the edification of the new structures of the Romanian society, so that Romania could open towards Europe and Europe towards Romania.

At the same time, President Iliescu stated that, as far as Romania's external policy was concerned, this would give priority to the present European structures and that its most ardent wish was to strengthen its cooperation with France and the European partners, to build a united Europe, capable to contribute to equilibrium in the international affairs, to a climate of peace and prosperity for the whole mankind.

"We take a special interest in your concept on a 'European confederation' and wish, on our part, to actively involve ourselves in analysing this concept, which is likely to lay the foundations of the Europe of tomorrow."

Concluding, President Ion Iliescu voiced the hope that the traditional friendship and cooperation relationships between the two countries will have an ascending course, in a broad range of domains.

Mitterrand Also Proposes Toast

AU1904093391 Bucharest ROMPRES in English 2340 GMT 18 Apr 91

[Report on toast made by French President Francois Mitterrand at state dinner in Bucharest on 18 April]

[Text] Bucharest, ROMPRES, 18/4/1991—As the first Western head of state paying a visit to Bucharest after 1989, I come to tell you France's determination to support Romania which has undertaken, in the difficult conditions inherited from the dictatorship, reforms conducive to a state of law and an open economy, said President Francois Mitterrand while proposing a toast Thursday night at a dinner offered by President Ion Iliescu. It is also an evidence of the empathy the French people nurtures for the Romanian people, which I want to bring here this evening. I am happy to renew with Romania and its population, so close to France and the French, the long tradition of friendship, contacts and affinities intertwined in the last two centuries.

France's president expressed his satisfaction of being in Romania at this special moment in the history of the Romanians and of Europe, assessing it as a moment of the two nations' falling in with one another again.

France has found again very quickly the road to Romania, President Mitterrand said mentioning his country's support to Romania immediately after the revolution.

He also referred to the twinning of towns and villages in the two countries, to the new cooperation ventures

initiated by the over ten members of the French Government who have already come to Bucharest, to the charity actions taken by French organizations in Romania.

Certainly, these visits, he said, find an explanation in the friendship linking our peoples as well as in our conviction that cooperation and dialogue are bearers of development and progress.

That is why the budgetary means France has put in the service of cultural, scientific and technical cooperation with Romania have been considerably increased, the president said further referring to the dissemination of the French language and culture through the three cultural centers newly created in Iasi, Cluj-Napoca, Timisoara, through bilingual high schools, universities and the cooperation in youth and sports affairs.

France's president said that economic contacts had thawed. Important projects are under study in car industry, in steel industry, telecommunications, tourism, building industry, and agriculture and food industry.

Europe, that is re-building up under our eyes, sees how Romania is taking up, little by little, its right place, highlighted President Mitterrand, adding in this respect the signing last year of an agreement of economic cooperation with the European community, the next phase being the negotiation of an accord to join the (words indistinct] president also mentioned that, due to the "PHARE" [Economic Reconstruction Aid for Poland and Hungary] program, Romania could benefit of aid of many kinds [words indistinct] that Romania was granted the status of special guest to the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe and has supported Romania decisively at times, as it thinks that the way your country has embarked on is the right of the difficulties you are faced with and that everybody is aware of", said the president.

We also think Romania's wish to take part in useful regional cooperation, [words indistinct] is a good sign. We are glad to see Romania's interest in the project for an European confederation [words indistinct] France last year.

The fact that there is no longer any confrontation between the East and the West and the democracy in many European states give us the right to hope that from now on any conflicts between European states willfully. In any case, we aspire at collective security to be gradually established in our continent. And, as that depends on confidence, good neighborhood, dialogue and the guarantees granted to minorities, so numerous [word indistinct] the states where they live." concluded President Francois Mitterrand.

France's president toasted to friendship and cooperation, to the happiness of the Romanian people.

Confers Honors on Iliescu, Roman

AU1904073991 Bucharest ROMPRES in English 2340 GMT 18 Apr 91

[Text] Bucharest, ROMPRES, 19/4/1991—France's President Francois Mitterrand conferred the Grand Cross of the Legion of Honour on Romania's President Ion Iliescu, while on Romania's Prime Minister Petre Roman the Grand Cross of the National Order of Merit.

Meets Opposition Leaders

AU1904074891 Bucharest ROMPRES in English 0644 GMT 19 Apr 91

[Text] Bucharest, ROMPRES, 19/4/1991—This morning [19 April] France's President Francois Mitterrand started his programme by a meeting with representatives of the opposition forces in Romania.

At ten o'clock the president of the French Republic will make a televised address in the rotunda of the Romanian Parliament.

President Ion Iliescu and President Francois Mitterrand are to meet with the journalists present in Romania's capital city today at noon at Cotroceni Palace.

In the afternoon President Mitterrand and Mme. Mitterrand will be the guests of Iasi Municipality.

Delivers Speech to Parliament

AU1904104491 Bucharest Domestic Service in Romanian 0737 GMT 19 Apr 91

[Speech by French President Francois Mitterrand at joint Parliament session in Bucharest 19 April—live, in French with simultaneous translation into Romanian]

[Summary From Poor Reception] "Ladies and Gentlemen: This morning we decided to visit a foreign legislature, and usually I recall the time when I myself was a deputy and senator of the French Republic for almost 35 years. Since the installation, a long time ago, of Napoleon Bonaparte at the end of the 18th Century, French custom and tradition have it—with a certain sad remembrance of a state coup in Parliament—that the president of the French Republic has no access to Parliament sessions. I want to repeat that this is a custom; therefore I try to make up for it elsewhere." [applause]

I have heard "what has been said about the first visit of a Western head of state to Romania" since December 1989. "I feel flattered that I was invited by you to address the representatives of the Romanian people, which I view as an honor. At the same time, it is a rare opportunity for me to address the Romanian people through you. It is easy for me to imagine what your current tasks are. You are now at the beginning of new times after such a long period in which it was impossible to imagine a state of law. You have to formulate a constitution that will approach all the essential points

that are absolutely necessary for establishing democracy. The criteria are easy to define. The people have their say on the basis of universal suffrage; they elect and have to elect their representatives freely. Relations between the executive and legislative power, as well as with the judicial power, have a permanent tradition in all the democracies we know. What is the exact relationship between the chief of the executive branch and the chief of state when the latter is not the chief of the executive as well? There are multiple variants linked to the historic mode you are interested in.

"You will pass laws that will decide your future. You have to change the structures of your economy and this is not the most easy thing to do. There are certain ways of thinking and of acting, only in this case no law is able to decide. This is a cultural phenomenon and it is your task to see to it that the Romanian people are aware that they are heading for a point of balance" for the various regions of Romania, for the social and professional strata, cultural options, intellectual values, urban and rural interests, the totality of social protection, "beginning with children and up to the elderly," and for those "usually excluded by society—the poorest and the handicapped. Here is a very big work site; however, I have not come here to teach lessons. I do not have the right to do so. Every political experience corresponds to a certain stage of history; however, your history is not identical to our history. You are masters of your options, but there surely are some universal orientations." There are universal principles that "are valid for all citizens of the world even if these principles are not recognized by all people—far from it. In any case, we know what lack of freedom means; we cannot be wrong in saying that it means a totalitarian regime. Freedoms were expressed more than two centuries ago beginning with France."

"One had to bear in mind that individual freedoms, characteristic of each individual, were not enough and that a social law had to be established to protect collectives and groups in the great conflicts of interest that exist in any human society."

"National resistance, which is often necessary, historic liberations, which are also repeated, as well as double resistance against oppression—all these are aspects of a substance that, from now on, should characterize, the efforts and pursuits of the Romanian people. I do not forget what this double resistance means when facing an outside enemy and an absolute power at home.

"A French writer and philosopher who was the mentor in writing of many generations at the beginning and middle of this century said: To think means to say no, but we should not exaggerate this. It indicates a certain tendency toward the affirmation of one's own self-esteem."

"The Romanians have never ceased to think. We hope that the moment will come, if it has not come already, when to think will mean: yes.

"During my visit, I was able to conduct talks with the authorities of your country, with representatives of the parliamentary opposition," and I continue the list with the "intellectuals, although I have always viewed this distinction somewhat strange; one can meet, for instance, both parliamentarians and intellectuals at the same time." (applause)

"As you see, the road is by no means a straight one. To orient ourselves, we have to be firmly centered on certain principles, namely the state of law and democracy as defined everywhere," including in "last evening's speech at the dinner given by the president of the republic." "I am talking of constant steps and efforts." The necessary time has to be devoted "to reflection and dialogue. You are the only ones to judge this aspect."

"A few days ago, two of your newspapers asked for an interview and I learned that there are 1,400 press organs in Romania." It seems that their tone is "quite lively, if not polemic. Ladies and gentlemen, believe me, I personally am very accustomed to this. We will eventually note that a sort of balance is achieved and that the people do not let themselves guided as easily as one would think, because there is something like a sense of history in the mind of the most simple and poor man and in the mind of the least informed man. We have to depend on the virtues of the nation, because without them neither you nor we would be able to do anything—neither here nor anywhere else.

"I note that a certain orientation has been established, the one that permitted me to come to see you. Thus, to my greatest regret, for nine years I had to decline the invitations addressed to me; to exclude any confusion, I can very easily imagine your material difficulties and, true, everything depends on the economy." "Enormous tasks devolve on you to reestablish balance, to stir initiative, and to reestablish relations both at home and internationally" that will lead to the "prosperity and efficiency" for each individual. "This is a permanent task and sometimes I question the things happening in my own country. This is why I followed the progress of your economic reform with interest," as well as the laws adopted "in connection with trade and the opening for foreign investments."

"Now, you are entering the second stage of this difficult price liberalization. This started a few weeks ago. Another important issue is the one concerning land ownership after so many years in which the system was fundamentally different. I assume that there are many Romanians who wish that things happen more rapidly. It is true that we never succeed in moving quickly enough, but (?we have to know that the road) toward democracy depends not only on our wish but also on the knowledge of reality and the parallel evolution of mentalities. France, which two years ago celebrated the bicentennial of the declaration of human rights and of its revolution, has gone through many periods of evolution and steps backward and has known long periods of totalitarianism." "On behalf of the French people I am telling you about an experience. In the same way the courage and

the intelligence of the Romanian people is required to maintain the considerable results achieved in the past less-than-18 month and to forcefully continue in this direction [words indistinct] you will return to the polls." "Your mission is clear. I suppose that you are animated by a certain feeling of pride for being the partisans of this immense task which consists of establishing the bases of democracy and bases of the future. In any event, I wish you much success." [applause]

"Last night, President Iliescu said that my country wishes to help as often as it thinks is necessary. Certainly, we do not have all that we would like to offer you but we can work" toward achieving the best results. "I believe I already said that in the first days, even the first hours in December 1989 and since then, we have continued to respond to Romania's appeals. There were acts of cooperation that started earlier." "The French proposed to reestablish an evident fact. It is obvious that Romania is in Europe and by no means anywhere else." [applause]

"It is a truth as simple as the truth about Columbus' egg [Saint Columbus, upon being told that it was impossible to stand an egg on end, did so by crushing one end], a truth that must be constantly repeated. You contributed much to Europe both in the past and the present, and you also gave much to France, I am priviliged to say, and I realize it especially now, as I address you." "The wooden sculptures of Oltenia" and Brancusi are among the foundations of great modern sculpture. Ionesco, Mircea Eliade also made their contribution to world culture. Celibidache, Radu Lupu, Ileana Cortubas, and others, Romanian mathematicians and physicians "in spite of the many years of isolation are listed among the best in the world. All these things are part of our common civilization which has deep roots; however, this tradition must be kept alive. We are part of the same continent and the same civilization and we must share the same future. We must search [word indistinct] for identity and forms of expression [words indistinct] and make sure that Europe is defined." "I am talking about the Europe to which we belong, the Europe of the Community of the 12 with 340 million inhabitants, the first commercial power in the world, which [word indistinct] could become a great technical and economic power and which does not lack cultural means; well, this Europe is not made out of only great amounts of steel or tonnes of butter." "A contemporary writer said that this European genius was born from diversity, complementarianism, and antagonisms and I believe that you do not lack them. What kind of Europe do we want to establish? First, we want to establish a Europe of security, starting with the Helsinki Final Act, and continuing with documents adopted within the CSCE meeting, the Paris Charter" and "all documents that date since last year. I remember that last year in autumn I chaired in Cologne" a meeting. "This was the most surprising meeting of current times. After two world wars which tore Europe apart and after the economic, political, social, cultural, and I do not know what other kind of separation which was established when Europe had been split in two" we were "all of us were there; 34 countries, of which 32 were from Europe [words indistinct] former enemies who pledged not to fight each other and tried to dissolve their security treaties, and maintain no more than one. I met there all the leaders of present-day Europe. Is that right Mr. President? Those were unforgettable times."

"Is it sufficiently well known in Romania and in the rest of Europe? Well. Within this framework the issue of peace has to be solved as well, problems which are by far more complicated, and the issue of minorities." [Word indistinct] that guarantees their right to identity, because without these rights, there is no democracy. Nevertheless, this has to be done by avoiding the dismantlement of states and of the current frontiers, because that would risk upsetting everything again. I think that all these difficulties must be approached from the top and not from the bottom. The rights of all communities throughout Europe should be well defined." [no opening quotes as received] "Likewise, Europe means economic solidarity and programs that are part of the European Community." "We have started implementing a certain number of measures. As of now, the European Community and Romania will work together. New relations should be developed and a treaty of cooperation with the European Community will be endorsed soon, after you have overcome certain difficult stages. We will probably be united within the same institutional framework. I know that joining the Community in the near future requires certain difficult constrictions. In a speech [word indistinct], I mentioned the idea of a European Confederation which should be joined by all European countries with equal rights and" duties. "Such a situation exists already within the community of the group of the twelve. Each has the same rights and has the same right of veto." "Why should we not expand this cooperation [words indistinct] in smaller structures, throughout Europe, given the fact that the countries I am talking about are democratic countries. This idea of European Confederation will be discussed in June at the initiative of President Vaclav Havel." "About 150 personalities will attend it, among them Romanians as well. Each of them will be free to advance suggestions." "Let us imagine the life of a common Europe which will have joint institutions" and "which will organize regular meetings, will have permanent structures, and will know how to work [words indistinct] through international cooperation. I am sure we will work for a common Europe. Ladies and gentlemen, these are the number of issues that I wanted to talk to you about."

"Europe has a formidable reservoir of enthusiastic people." "The road on which you have embarked is irreversible." "The road toward security and freedom in Europe must be is irreversible. Nobody should accept a return. The salvation of civilization is at stake. This is the message of hope and confidence that I wanted to address you on behalf of France. I said it at the beginning as well, I turn to all Romanians when I say, my role is not to (?distinguish) among them—I would be unable to do that. But I am here at the parliament and whom could I give my message first of all if not to you." "How could I not make my wishes accompany Romania's demarches in fulfilling the role incumbent on it, both as a country in itself and as an element of Europe to which it belongs."

"I want to express everything that I feel—the wish, the hope, and the solidarity—to overcome the difficulties of this century and dress and cure the wounds made by the evil that destroyed so many values during this century, to rebuild confidence in spite of all difficulties, to trust a state of law, and to work ceaselessly until the last day of our lives. We will not be able to stop working. We will have to work constantly to safeguard freedom. Long live Romania! Long live France! [applause]"

Elysee Palace Spokesman Cited on Visit

AU1804201491 Bucharest ROMPRES in English 1925 GMT 18 Apr 91

[Text] Bucharest, ROMPRES, 18/4/1991—It is not only a relaunching of bilateral relations, it is not only France and Romania, but it is a general view on cooperation between Western Europe, Central and Eastern Europe, stated the spokesman for Elysee Palace at a news conference. President Mitterrand wishes that Eastern Europe and Romania were on the same plane with the other countries in the area—that is with perspectives for cooperation like Poland, Czechoslovakia and Hungary. These two parts of Eastern Europe are not opposed and this is but a beginning. I cannot refer now to details. As for the perspectives of the treaty Mr. Iliescu mentioned in a recent interview, Mr. Dumas and his counterpart will sign letters tomorrow morning that will open negotiations without setting a calendar proper, and these negotiations will finalize in a cooperation treaty. This thing cannot be done in two days as it is something serious which cannot be improvised, specified Mr. Hubert Vedrine, spokesman for Elysee Palace.

Presidents Issue Statement on Republics' Future

LD1804194491 Belgrade TANJUG Domestic Service in Serbo-Croatian 1858 GMT 18 Apr 91

[Text] Ohrid, 18 Apr (TANJUG)—The presidents of the republics, or republican presidencies, continued their talks in Ohrid today on overcoming the political and state crisis in Yugoslavia and on the character of the future Yugoslav community.

According to the statement, the meeting focused on the question of holding a referendum for citizens in the republics to state their stand on the two solutions for the character of the future Yugoslav community.

According to the conclusion that was adopted, it will be proposed to the assemblies of all the republics that by the end of May 1991 they should hold referenda at which the questions will be formulated in such a way that a clear answer will be obtained from citizens on whether they are for the transformation of the present Yugoslav community into 1) an alliance of sovereign states, or 2) for it remaining a federal state. The two models (solutions) cited are understood as the concepts defined in more detail in the statement from the meeting of presidents of the republics, or presidents of the republican presidencies, in Brdo kod Kranja on 11 April 1991.

The president of the Republic of Serbia and president of the Montenegrin Presidency consider that the proposal on a direct decision between a federal state and alliance of states overlooks the fact that Yugoslavia exists and artificially places citizens in the position of having to choose between the indisputable fact of the existence of Yugoslavia as an international legal subject and the option of an alliance of sovereign states, not one of which exists at present as a sovereign and independent state. A referendum on a possible alliance of sovereign states would mean that such states should first be constituted as independent and sovereign and defined on the basis of the directly expressed will of their citizens and the nations living in them.

In this respect, the republics that launched the initiative for constituting themselves as independent and sovereign states would first have to vote—in a referendum—for or against their separation from Yugoslavia and their constitution into independent states. Voting would enable the members of all Yugoslav nations living in their respective republics to express their will and orientation. The most important thing about respecting the right of nations to self-determination and about a referendum on the aforementioned question is that no nation and no republic could ever be kept within Yugoslavia or taken out of Yugoslavia against its will. Likewise, Yugoslavia as a state cannot be abolished by a unilateral decision.

Slovenia has already conducted a referendum (plebiscite) in which it opted for an independent state. In keeping with the statement on good intentions and the resolution on dissociation, Slovenia is prepared for talks on setting up a possible community of sovereign states on the territory of present-day Yugoslavia.

An agreement was reached to resume talks on the main joint functions that would offer concrete solutions to relations in a future community.

The presidents recognized the vital need for talks on establishing principles for the consensus regulation of mutual rights and responsibilities arising from the present coexistence in the SFRY because there is both the need for and interest in this, regardless of the final solution to the Yugoslav crisis.

At today's meeting the presidents also agreed to ensure the necessary conditions in all republics for respecting the legal system. In this respect it is vital that the republican and federal authorities take the necessary measures to ensure complete safety and peace for all citizens in the country as well as for tourists in the coming season.

Republican Presidents Meet Press

LD1804190991 Belgrade TANJUG Domestic Service in Serbo-Croatian 1828 GMT 18 Apr 91

[Excerpts] Belgrade, 18 Apr (TANJUG)—Following their fourth round of talks on the political future of the country, the presidents of the republican presidencies of the six Yugoslav republics talked to about 200 Yugoslav and foreign journalists in the Park Hotel in Ohrid tonight.

Tonight's news conference can be also heard by Yugoslav citizens in Australia, North America, and European countries via Skopje Radio.

At the outset of the conference, the host of the meeting, Kiro Gligorov, asked everyone present to pay tribute, by observing a minute of silence, to the members of Titograd radio's team killed in a tragic accident—Slavica Milovic, Mihailo Boskovic, and Zeljko Vujacic.

Following his announcement that the Croatian president would not be present for the full duration of the news conference, Gligorov briefly outlined the key points in the statement issued from today's round of talks. He said that the six leaders have concluded that the assemblies of all the republics should call a referendum by the end of May this year, in which citizens would vote on whether the Yugoslav community should transform itself into an alliance of soveriegn states or whether it should remain a federal state. The results of the referendum, the agreement on the state's common functions, and the principles for regulating mutual rights and obligations between the republics will be the basis for an the agreement on resolving Yugoslavia's crisis, Gligorov concluded.

The first question a POBJEDA journalist addressed to Croatian President Franjo Tudjman was: Which historic facts led him to establish that Boka and Kotor were part of Croatia in 1918? Tudjman's answer was brief: "Boka

was incorporated in Dalmatia, while Dalmatia was incorporated in the Croatian kingdom."

An OSLOBODJENJE reporter asked "the four as to whether they know what the two are discussing between themselves." President of the Presidency of Bosnia-Hercegovina Alija Izetbegovic said that "Tudjman and Milosevic have a great many things to discuss." In his words, Croatian-Serbian relations are at the heart of the Yugoslav crisis.

President of Macedonia Kiro Gligorov regards the fact that Tudjman and Milosevic are discussing relations between Croatia and Serbia as their legitimate and normal concern. It would not be right, though, he added, if they discussed those issues that concern other republics too, and that are our common concern.

Montenegrin Presidency President Momir Bulatovic, while noting that this question was directed to him with "a certain amount of reserve," replied that these talks should not irritate anyone, all the more so because they are being expanded by expert teams and in other ways.

Slovene Presedency President Milan Kucan said that he agreed with Izetbegovic and added that "what we know about these talks is what they have told us, but I am sure that they are not to the detriment of third parties."

Croatian television's reporter asked Milosevic whether the reason for his staunch commitment to Yugoslavia is the fact, as she put it, that the Yugoslav Peoples' Army [JNA], the federal administration, diplomatic service ... employ 1 million Serbs, each of whom has a four-member family, so Yugoslavia has to feed 4 million Serbs. Milosevic briefly replied that that would be the least likely of reasons for his commitment to a federation. The said number does not correspond with reality either. One million employees—this is perhaps the number of all employees in all the administrative services in the entire country, he added.

Milosevic was the first to reply to the question of a Yutel reporter about international support for Yugoslavia's unity: "Any help for Yugoslavia's unity that does not imply interfering in its internal affairs is welcome". Gligorov said that "the international public and international political and other factors are realities just as much as our internal situation is our own reality. Failure to take into account either reality does not lead to the right kind of solution."

Tudjman said that "we are grateful to all those who have given support to the democratic transformation of Yugoslavia's political life, by suggesting to all the sides in Yugoslavia that solutions should be sought peacefully and democratically." I am pointing out with satisfaction, he added, that the international public is mature enough to acknowledge the existence of the republics as a matter of fact, and that it suggests that it is up to the republics and their peoples to find their solutions. In this respect, he said, the conduct of the international public is sometimes more serious than that of some people in Yugoslavia itself.

Izetbegovic sees this international support as a call on the Yugoslav peoples to stay together, not to disperse. I do not know whether we are going to succeed in achieving this. As far as Bosnia-Hercegovina is concerned, this is where our interest is, he added.

Kucan views international support for Yugoslavia as proof that a Yugoslav problem is also a European one, a fact no one has wanted to acknowledge for a long time. I do not regard this support, Kucan continued, as support for Yugoslavia's unity but as support for resolving those problems that brought up the question of Yugoslavia's unity in the first place.

A Novi Sad television reporter asked whether and in what way the presidents will inform the assemblies of their republics about the course of the talks.

Of course, each of us must inform the legislature, Kiro Gligorov replied, adding that it is up to each president to decide in what way he will do this. Informing those present that the Montenegrin Presidency, which next Thursday will be host to the meeting of the six Yugoslav republics in Cetinje, has already been in contacts with legislative groups, Bulatovic said that the leadership of this republic will of course inform the assembly. Whether we go into the second round or end the talks with the first round, depends on the results of our discussions, he said.

In reply to a question from a POLITIKA reporter, addressed to Presidents Tudjman and Kucan, asking them to comment on a statement by the pope, who came out against the separation of Slovenia and Croatia from Yugoslavia, the Croatian president briefly replied that he is not acquainted with the pope's statement. Regarding the efforts of the United States, the European Community, and the USSR for the preservation of Yugoslavia, Tudjman interpreted them as a desire on the part of these countries to avoid all possible calamities, adding that the world fears the possibility of civil war in Yugoslavia.

In their stances on Yugoslavia these countries proceed from their own viewpoints, considering that any other outcome of the crisis in Yugoslavia would have a negative effect on Eastern Europe and on the USSR, and would have repercussions in the West, the Croatian president explained. "We know," he added, "that the present crisis has profound causes and that Yugoslavia as it is today can no longer be a factor of stability and peace in Europe." While respecting the stands of these international factors, the presidents of the Yugoslav republics, according to Tudjman, are obliged above all to conduct policies that are in the interests of their own nation.

Immediately after this reply, Tudjman left the news conference, explaining that he had important meetings arranged for this evening.

According to Kucan, the statement of the head of the Roman Catholic Church is proof that Yugoslavia has become a European and world problem precisely because of the failure to resolve its crisis.

Slovene television journalists asked whether Momir Bulatovic changed his stand on the referendum in the course of the day, because it was unofficially learned that during the morning talks he was in favor of citizens voting by republic, and in the afternoon that he was in for individual federal units voting in a referendum in the republics for separation from Yugoslavia.

Stating that this was a question of misinformation, Bulatovic said that he presented the view this morning that a referendum of citizens at the republican level was, in his view, the democratic solution, although he considers that this model is a hybrid, because the right to self-determination belongs to the nations.

Political wisdom is needed, he added, and a compromise solution should be found, so the realization of the right of one nation does not endanger that of another.

A journalist from Pristina TV asked Milosevic and Gligorov whether, in agreements about Yugoslavia's future, there was any discussion about nationalities living in Yugoslavia. Everyone living in Yugoslavia has equal rights, Milosevic replied, and Gligorov added that there was no discussion about any nationality. [passage omitted]

Milosevic recalled the stand in the statement in which he and Bulatovic stressed that decisionmaking must express the will and interests of all nations living in either of the republics, and that no nation or republic can be kept in or taken out of Yugoslavia against its will, just as Yugoslavia cannot be abolished by a unilateral decision. [passage omitted] Kucan replied to the second question by saying that he believes that money will circulate freely on the condition that the political situation is stabilized and reforms are implemented. Regarding the portion of the debt that "belongs" to Slovenia, it would be easy to determine the period in which it would be paid off.

After this, Milosevic explained that the fact that a representative from Serbia was among the group of experts [who prepared the project on referendum] should not be interpreted as Serbia's consent to what has been proposed. On the contrary, there are serious objections. In his opinion, the existence of Yugoslavia has been completely overlooked in the project of the group of experts. Yugoslavia's status is both legal and legitimate, and Yugoslavia is the only internationally-recognized legal subject, the Serbian president stressed.

A Belgrade Television reporter asked presidents Gligorov and Izetbegovic about the attitude of Bosnia-Hercegovina and Macedonia toward the referendum.

Alija Izetbegovic replied: "We made it clear in Brdo kod Kranja and we remain committed to this solution. Namely, we had two options and we opted for a referendum of citizens. That is all.

Our stand is set out in a separate paragraph in the Brdo kod Kranja statement and I will repeat it, Kiro Gligorov said. We favor a referendum of the republics as represented by the citizens of each republic, without any attempt at changing our borders. In our view, a referendum of nations in certain republics would be unacceptable. Second, we maintain that parallel talks should be conducted not only to determine which republic and which people in a given republic favor a federal state or an alliance of states, but also to outline all those things which will be the future community's shared interests and functions. Every dissociation implies that an agreement has previously been reached on mutual rights and obligations between the Yugoslav republics.

Momir Bulatovic noted that these are precisely the most time-consuming issues today. The view I was advocating, he said, on which both Milosevic and I agreed; we set out two options in Brdo kod Kranja but we treated them as an aim and possible result [as received]. To devise a solution one must have certain means. We advocated the standpoint whereby an alliance of sovereign states, as a possible goal, necessarily requires an endorsement of subjects—that is, republics that are first to be constituted as sovereign states and only then will they decide how and with whom they will constitute their alliance of sovereign states. We wanted to clarify this procedure and make it unambiguous, so as to do away with all possible doubts among Yugoslavia's citizens.

The same applies to the second variant—that is, a federal state—in which case one should also find out which nations and which republics want to live in such a state. One of the crucial political questions in Yugoslavia is that although it is dangerous when outvoting takes place at Yugoslav level, it is no less dangerous when it takes place at republican level.

A NOVA MAKEDONIJA reporter addressed his question to all the republican presidents there, barring Slobodan Milosevic, whose reply he did not consider to be necessary.

Have the gentlemen, the presidents who are interested in eliminating the federal government, and particularly in eliminating Prime Minister Markovic, changed their view regarding this in given that the international community's financial support is evidently conditional in nature?

Ante Markovic's government was not discussed today, Kiro Gligorov said. We maintain that this is a matter for the federal legislature, which gave the prime minister his mandate. We should not focus on whether this government should remain.

If Serbian-Croatian relations are in crisis in Yugoslavia, why do you not leave them (Serbia and Croatia) alone so they can solve their dispute in a bilateral way; and has Milosevic changed his stance on the referendum since Brdo kod Kranja, a NOVA MAKEDONIJA reporter asked.

Milosevic said that Serbia does not question the institution of referendum as the only democratic way of expressing the will of Yugoslavia's peoples; it is only pointing out the necessary moves preceding it.

Replying to the second question, addressed directly to him, Milosevic briefly said that the problem of Serbo-Croatian relations is not the only cause of Yugoslavia's crisis; it is rather part of that crisis; therefore, this problem should be treated accordingly in its entirety. [passage omitted]

A Radio Yugoslavia journalist had two questions for all the presidents: Whether the people presently leading the federal state will be taking part in the talks on the joint functions, and whether there is not a contradiction between the statement that the federal government is within the domain of the Assembly and Presidency on the one hand, and the fact that agreement is not being given to laws which would facilitate elections to the Federal Assembly on the other.

The president of Macedonia said that the government, which already has draft solutions for the transitional period, is blocked; however, the responsibility for this now lies with the delegations of all the rpeublics in the Federal Assembly, and not with the presidents, who have no powers to determine the fate of the government. He agreed that in the talks on the joint functions of the common state, in addition to the experts, all others who can contribute to the successful outcome of these talks should take part. The bases of this agreement, Gligorov said, should be made public and considered in the legislatures.

Momir Bulatovic, however, distinguished between the question of elections to the Federal Chamber and the concrete, personality composition of the Federal Executive Council [FEC]. He added that the Montenegrin Assembly does not criticize the principles of the government's reform program, but rather the deviation from this program in its implementation. We do not like the fact that not enough is known in the country about which are the political factors that publicly support the government, but do not give it any concrete instruments for realizing its policies, and who are those who, despite the criticism, consider that the FEC should acquire the necessary powers. [passage omitted] A journalist from the Macedonian TV asked Milosevic how he explains the fact that, despite advocating a federal state, he never mentioned either Macedonians or the Macedonian issue in the course of his talks in Athens.

Milosevic explained that these issues were not on the agenda of the talks with his Greek hosts, and that he was representing neither Yugoslavia nor Macedonia on his visit to Greece.

Bearing in mind the well-known stands of the CSCE on the inviolability of European borders and on the interests of Yugoslavia as a whole, there are no reasons for exacerbation of relations with Greece, Milosevic said.

Kiro Gligorov then stressed that Macedonia advocates good relations with all its neighbors, including Greece.

After Milosevic mentioned the CSCE, Gligorov referred to the Paris and Helsinki Conventions, as well as to the State Department report on the flagrant violation of human rights in Greece. [passage omitted]

The six of us, said Izetbegovic, should have found some kind of uniform solution that would then have to be subjected to a test in a referendum. It is obvious that we failed, and that people should be faced with two options in the referendum, but I am not sure that this is the way to solve the Yugoslav question. There will be a dual result of the referendum and this will perhaps be a step toward a solution, although we did not reach a compromise on which I and Gligorov insisted, said Izetbegovic. [passage omitted]

On being asked by a reporter of the Albanian section of Skopje Radio whether only Serbs will vote in Serbia's referendum or whether members of other nations, nationalities, and ethnic communities will vote too, Milosevic said, "In Serbia no one in his right mind thinks that anyone should be denied civil rights."

A HINA [Croatian News Agency] journalist asked Milosevic about his estimate of the results of Serbia's coming referendum and how long Serbia intended to retain its three votes in Yugoslavia's Presidency. The president of Serbia said he believed "that the vast majority of the Serbian people want to live in one state, and for this state to be Yugoslavia." As far as Serbia's three votes are concerned, this is, in his words, the consequence of a mechanism and system that split Serbia into three parts, provided the provinces with a status of state, and prevented Serbia from exercising its vital interests. The blame for these three votes, he said, should be laid on those who wanted to disunite Serbia and the Serbian people, rather than on Serbia.

One of the Macedonian journalists asked whether the others were suffering from the problems and disagreements between Serbia and Croatia. Kucan said "that unfortunately there is no other reality." Serbia with its own problems, Croatia with its own problems, and certainly we with our own problems, we are all part of this reality. But we do not all have to suffer because of other people's failure to solve problems, he said.

Izetbegovic said that "this is not his impresson". I have said on many occasions, Gligorov replied, that I feel like an equal member in these talks in terms of my being able

to voice my agreement or disagreement. The problems we are discussing are of such a nature that they really demand a negotiator's patience and a willingness to understand others.

A TANJUG reporter asked Izetbegovic whether Bosnia-Hercegovina, given its growing political tensions, wants to and can survive as an independent state if there is a definitive disintegration of Yugoslavia. The Bosnia-Hercegovina Presidency president said that he believes that it wants to and can do so. At least 70-80 percent of the citizens support the republic's survival; perhaps even 100 percent. There are, however, various views on Bosnia-Hercegovina's position in a future Yugoslavia. The referendum will prove that Bosnia-Hercegovina will remain united and within its present borders. We have no doubts about this but we want nevertheless to put this to the test, both for our own sake and for the sake of the citizens, he added.

The last question was addressed to Milosevic by a Macedonian radio reporter who asked him whether he knew in the territory of which of the six sovereign Yugoslav republics he was situated. After requiring that the question, asked in the Macedonian language, be repeated he replied that he has said in public on several occasions that he does not maintain that the Yugoslav republics are sovereign. Only Yugoslavia is sovereign; the republics are equal in Yugoslavia. "I am in the republic of Macedonia, an equal republic in Yugoslavia."

Gligorov replied to this by saying "that Macedonia proceeds from its declaration, recently adopted by the Macedonian parliament, that we have been a sovereign republic, not since the adoption of the declaration, but ever since the ASNOM [Anti-Fascist Council of the National Liberation of Macedonia] assembly in 1944."

Slovene Assembly Meets on Military Service Issue

AU1804142791 Belgrade Domestic Service in Serbo-Croatian 1300 GMT 18 Apr 91

[Dragoslav Kosaric report on Slovene Assembly meeting in Ljubljana on 18 April]

[Text] The debate on the law on military service of the Republic of Slovenia has been eclipsed by the session of the Commission for Cadres and Appointments at which Prime Minister Lojze Peterle personally expounded on the reasons for the first reshuffle of his government—that is, the replacement of Information Minister Stane Stanic by Jelko Kacin, former deputy republican secretary for national defense.

Peterle believes that Kacin will be more efficient in realizing the planned project called the media and the promotion of Slovenia. Jelko Kacin is a close associate of Janez Jansa and one of the authors of the concept of creating a republican Army. The Assembly will decide about his appointment on 24 April.

One more event in the Slovene Assembly has been impatiently awaited. At Peterle's proposal, the deputies will be addressed by Harvard Professor Geoffrey Sachs, known as an adviser to the Federal Executive Council in creating the project to reform Yugoslavia's economic and monetary system.

Milan Kucan and Ante Markovic met secretly in the Strmol Castle not far from Brnik last night. The talks opened at 2200 and ended three hours later.

No official announcement has yet been issued on this meeting and the talks. We have learned unofficially that before coming to Slovenia, Markovic met [Croatian President] Franjo Tudjman in Zagreb.

Some Slovene political circles are of the opinion that Markovic is experiencing a great crisis and that he is ready for anything, which would mean, according to some commentators, that one may speak about the potential danger of a military intervention in Yugoslavia. It is hardly possible that Slovenia will give in at this stage of the Yugoslav crisis.

Spegelj's Attorney Doubts Court's 'Objectiveness'

LD1804150391 Belgrade TANJUG in English 1430 GMT 18 Apr 91

[Text] Zagreb, April 18 (TANJUG)—At the outset of the main hearing today at the trial of Croatian Defense Minister Martin Spegelj and seven other defendants, charged with "preparing an armed rebellion in Croatia," the defense challenged all members of the military court board of judges, the military court president, and the military prosecutor.

The defense said it "doubted the objectiveness" of the board of judges, the court president and the military prosecutor, and requested that they state whether they were members of the League of Communists-Movement for Yugoslavia, which is considered to be the successor of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia.

The counsels for the defense explained that it appeared from the indictment that "the proceedings are conducted against a party, the Croatian Democratic Union," which they said would mean that "members of one party are trying members of another party."

The hearing, which will resume tomorrow, was actually the beginning of the trial, which had to be put off on April 8 because of violent demonstrations staged outside the military court building in Zagreb.

The investigation against Spegelj and the other defendants was opened after a 30-minute documentary, secretely filmed by the federal defense secretariat, was shown on television on January 25.

The film showed that Spegelj had organized a secret purchase of arms from Hungary for the Croatian police in October and November last year. Spegelj was also shown discussing with Croatian Democratic Union

members plans for the conducting of a civil war, attacks on Yugoslav People's Army garrisons, and assassinations of Yugoslav People's Army officers.

The Croatian authorities have confirmed the arms purchase, but insisted that Minister Spegelj was only carrying out the decision of the Croatian government. A law granting immunity to the members of the Croatian government was passed after Spegelj and the other seven persons were indicted.

The defense today again insisted on Spegelj's immunity, and said that criminal proceedings could not be instituted against him "for as long as a permission is not obtained from competent organs in Croatia."

Lawyer Vukovic challenged the authority of the military court since the federal laws which are contrary to the Croatian constitution have been suspended in Croatia.

Spegelj and two other defendants failed to turn up for the trial today. The prosecution reiterated that the Croatian police had failed to place Spegelj and the two other defedants under detention, although ordered to do so twice.

Trial Awaits Court Order Implementation

LD1904112191 Belgrade TANJUG Domestic Service in Serbo-Croatian 1053 GMT 19 Apr 91

[Text] Zagreb, 19 Apr (TANJUG)—The trial of Croatian Defense Minister Martin Spegelj and Ivan Belani will be convened only when the bodies of the Croatian Ministry for Internal Affairs implement an order of the Zagreb Military Court for these two defendants to be brought to the court.

The president of the Zagreb Military Court, Colonel Zivko Mazic, stated this for journalists, following the court decision to hold separate trials for Spegelj and Belani. Colonel Mazic also cited the order for Spegelj and Belani to be brought to court by force. The order was already issued by an investigative judge of the Zagreb Court when a decision to carry out an investigation and detain the accused was made.

Draskovic Scheduled To Stand Trial in Belgrade

LD1904090191 Belgrade TANJUG in English 0559 GMT 19 Apr 91

[Text] Belgrade, April 19 (TANJUG)—The leader of the Serbian Renewal [Renaissance] Movement (SPO), the strongest opposition party in Yugoslavia's biggest republic of Serbia, will stand trial before a Belgrade court on Monday, April 22. A statement issued by the SPO leadership says that its leader, Vuk Draskovic, 45, journalist turned popular writer, stands charged with 'inciting to resistance' and 'involvement in a violent riot'.

Draskovic's party had organized opposition demonstrations in Belgrade on March 9 against the reporting of the mass media in the republic, whose bias it laid at the door of the ruling socialist party of Serbia (SPS). Two people were killed and dozens were injured in subsequent clashes.

The SPO statement says that Draskovic will be represented by seven lawyers, some of the best known in the land, who will be joined by 'another 300 eminent solicitors in Serbia and Yugoslavia' as the trial goes on.